



Trends in policies, programs and practices in the
Australasian First Year Experience literature
2000–2010

Karen Nelson, John Clarke, Sally Kift and Tracy Creagh

**The First Year in Higher Education
Research Series on Evidence-based Practice**

Trends in policies, programs and practices in the
Australasian First Year Experience literature
2000–2010

The First Year in Higher Education
Research Series on Evidence-based Practice
No. 1

Karen Nelson, John Clarke, Sally Kift and Tracy Creagh

The First Year in Higher Education Research Series on Evidence-based Practice

This publication is the first in what we hope will be a series of scholarly reports that synthesise the evidence about practice-based initiatives and pragmatic approaches in Aotearoa/New Zealand and Australia that aim to enhance the experience of commencing students in the higher education sector. This publication, Number 1 in the series, examines the first year experience literature from 2000–2010 through two lenses: first the set of first year curriculum design principles and second the generational approach to describing the maturation of initiatives.

In future titles, we plan to focus on some of the key areas of institutional effort such as:

- Peer programs and the first year experience
- Orientation and transition: What really works
- First year curriculum and assessment: Mediating transition.

ISBN: 978-1-921897-12-2

Citation details for this work:

Nelson, K. J., Clarke, J. A., Kift, S. M., & Creagh, T. A. (2011). *Trends in policies, programs and practices in the Australasian First Year Experience literature 2000–2010* (The First Year in Higher Education Research Series on Evidence-based Practice, No. 1). Brisbane, Australia: Queensland University of Technology.

© Queensland University of Technology, 2011

This work is published under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-Noncommercial-Share Alike 3.0 Australia Licence. Under this licence you are free to copy, distribute, display and perform the work and to make derivative works.

Attribution: You must attribute the work to the original authors and include the following statement:
Support for the original work was provided by Queensland University of Technology.

Noncommercial: You may not use this work for commercial purposes.

Share Alike: If you alter, transform, or build on this work, you may distribute the resulting work only under a license identical to this one. For any reuse or distribution, you must make clear to others the license terms of this work.

Any of these conditions can be waived if you get permission from the copyright holder.

To view a copy of this license, visit <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-sa/3.0/au> or send a letter to Creative Commons, 444 Castro Street, Suite 900, Mountain View, California, 94041, USA.

Requests and inquiries concerning these rights should be addressed to Queensland University of Technology, GPO Box 2434, Brisbane, Qld, 4001 or through the website: <http://www.qut.edu.au>.

Published by Queensland University of Technology.



Preface

We hope that you find *The First Year in Higher Education Research Series on Evidence-based Practice*—in particular this first issue, *Trends in policies, programs and practices in the Australasian First Year Experience literature 2000–2010*—a useful reference for resources designed to enhance the experience of students commencing their journey into higher education. We wish to thank our colleagues who provided feedback on early drafts of this publication and would also appreciate your feedback and comments on specific aspects of this review as well as on the general concept of the research series based on evidence-based practice. Suggestions you may have for future issues would be particularly welcome.

This is the first time a review of this nature has been attempted for the Australasian context and we found that the task we set ourselves nearly two years ago grew in magnitude, extent and complexity the more deeply we became immersed in the range of available material. We have attempted to include relevant exemplars and in so doing have also tried to be representative of approaches and sources of evidence.

In this regard, we have not made any judgements, other than those determined by the criteria we set for the review, about which items to include: We have merely attempted to bring to light the good work undertaken by our colleagues across the sector interpreted through our frames of reference, the lens of curriculum principles and the lens of generational approaches to the first year experience. However, it is inevitable and regrettable that we may have missed good and relevant work. Thus, we apologise for any errors of omission or interpretation, particularly if they relate to your own or your favourite materials. We would be very grateful to readers who notify us of any such errors, so we can correct them and include any new or missing material in the forthcoming publications in this series.

We hope you enjoy reading this review and find it a useful addition to your library.

Kindest regards

Karen Nelson
John Clarke
Sally Kift
Tracy Creagh

Downloaded Copy



Foreword

This volume is an important and valuable contribution, marking a new point of sophistication in research and practice on the first year experience. It deals elegantly with a decade of knowledge by interpreting it through the two theoretical lenses of the First Year Curriculum Principles and the generational approach to the FYE.

Not so long ago, research into the first year experience was rare outside of the United States, and the theorising and depth of conceptualisation was piecemeal. For universities, the idea of evidence-based practice was largely unheard of and first year students were not given any particular attention—at worst they were regarded as cash cows, and at best many academics may not have grasped the fact that they owed their jobs to first year students. But universities have shifted their attention quite markedly to understanding their students and the character of the student experience, a trend depicted loosely and perhaps imperfectly as ‘student-centredness’. Correspondingly, or perhaps as one of the drivers, the field of research into the first year experience has grown and matured significantly.

In the Australian case, one of the first systematic studies into the first year experience was conducted at the University of Melbourne by Don Anderson about 50 years ago. The research that followed was sporadic until the mid 1990s, at which time a more systematic and coherent program of research and development began, triggered in part by research conducted by the Centre for the Study of Higher Education. In the United Kingdom, researchers such as Mantz Yorke and Bernard Longden followed the Australian lead. This upsurge began a mere 15 years ago, a relatively short period in the history of universities, coinciding in the main part with massification of participation and the new awareness that retention and academic success can no longer be assumed as the student body becomes demographically more diverse and students’ needs and expectations become less homogenous.

The need for a better evidence base on the first year experience and the transition to university seems sure to grow. There is a strong likelihood during the next 10–20 years that the higher education systems of most developed nations will enter the phase of universal participation. Australia has set national targets for attainment and equity and uncapped the number of government-support university places as the principal policy mechanism with the objective of creating a ‘demand-driven system’. In New Zealand, higher education reform is at the forefront of national social and economic agendas.

The trend towards universal participation will usher in dramatic changes in the character of the first year of higher education. These changes provide a crude ‘roadmap’ for the next generation of analysis and interpretation of first year policy and practice. Clearly the pathways into higher education will diversify and the relationship between these and a successful first year need to be better understood. Certainly there will be more students with lower levels of academic preparedness for higher education, confronting deeply held beliefs about higher education and merit. There will also be greater diversity in student motives and expectations, and the patterns of student participation in the day-to-day life of universities and other tertiary institutions will undergo further transformation.

There will be greater diversity too in the nature of higher education institutions and the structure and purposes of first year courses themselves. One of the present constraints on building participation rates is the largely ‘batch-like’ nature of undergraduate delivery, with problems on both the supply side, such as in infrastructure and staffing, and on the demand side, in the inflexibility of access. Whether and in what ways new delivery paradigms will be imagined and implemented—admittedly, highly complex undertakings—will be among the determinants of the effectiveness of institutional responses to a new era of higher education.

Chances are the expansion of access to first year of higher education will be a key trigger for a reformulation of the academic workforce to forge more explicitly differentiated roles. Though the work of universities has changed considerably, traditional conceptions of academic work persist. Yet, fair and valued specialisation and disaggregation in the character of the roles of individuals might mean more productive engagement with the needs of first year students.

With the delivery challenges associated with universal participation, tertiary institutions will surely look to harness eLearning in new ways in order to improve flexibility for students and reduce the pressure on campus bricks and mortar. At the same time, there are likely to be efforts to generate a more fruitful blending of the curriculum and the co-curriculum. Universities will seek to devise ways of widening 'what counts': to capture student engagement with the non-taught, non-assessed co-curriculum; and to recognise and reward this engagement, especially in the areas of community engagement and service learning.

Of course the taught and assessed curriculum will always be what really counts in the eyes of most students. Assessment practices in universities are remarkably impervious to change; these remain a prime frontier for pedagogical reform. Improved assessment practices will improve student learning in the first year. Strategic assessment—more focused, targeted assessment on the things that matter—might reduce academic workloads too, creating greater efficiency and effectiveness in academics' engagement with the transition to university and the experience of first year students.

These are some of the current and emerging areas for research and for practical interventions that will be informed by this work. The quality of the first year experience is in many ways a measure of the health of our universities and other tertiary institutions. This will be no less true as higher education systems move inexorably into the phase of universal participation. The present volume locates, assembles and makes sense of the literature that can guide effective policy and practice. The interpretation of the decade of previous work, through the theoretical lenses, provides a unique perspective on the interventions and challenges to be considered. This is a fine work of scholarship and a timely basis for advancing quality.

Richard James
Professor of Higher Education and
Director, Centre for the Study of Higher Education
The University of Melbourne



Executive summary

The rationale for undertaking this review of Australasian—defined here as Australia and Aotearoa/New Zealand¹—first year experience (FYE) literature is multifaceted. It acknowledges the uniqueness of the Australasian sociopolitical context and its influence on the interests and output of researchers. Consequently, this literature complements existing reviews out of North America, the United Kingdom and Europe, providing a more balanced worldview by compensating for the necessarily limited coverage of Australasian studies in existing reviews. The review is also timely. For example, in Australia the sociopolitical context is one of a ‘landmark reform agenda for higher education ... that will transform the scale, potential and quality of the nation’s universities and open the doors of higher education to a new generation of Australians’ (Australian Government Department of Education, Employment and Workplace Relations [DEEWR], 2009, p. 5); and in Aotearoa, the last decade has witnessed substantial reform of the entire tertiary sector (including higher education) to realign with the government’s social and economic agenda (New Zealand Ministry of Education, 2006, pp. 15–16). Consequently, FYE research and practice is currently undergoing exponential growth in activity and interest. This review can both capitalise on that growth and contribute to Australasian (and global) imperatives of assuring participation and attainment. It identifies gaps and hence a possible future research direction and agenda, and provides an opportunity for the development of a shared understanding of the higher education context in its first year aspect as reflected in the literature.

The review surveyed almost 400 empirical reports and conceptual discussions produced over the period 2000–2010 that deal with the stakeholders, institutions and the higher education sector in Australasia. It was not possible to impose a standardised definition of *first year* on the literature because authors rarely provided a definition, simply using terms such as *first year*, *Year 1* or *commencing students*.

Essentially, the definition of first year is whatever the authors deemed it to be. This inclusive approach also takes into account the shifting focus of what it means to be a first year student. While the literature search was not deliberately restricted to undergraduate students, it revealed an almost exclusive preoccupation by investigators with that mode with minimal reference to postgraduate students.

For a variety of substantive sociopolitical and pragmatic reasons, the period was divided for discussion purposes into sequential periods of 2000–2003, 2004–2007 and 2008–2010. The literature was analysed in terms of trends in the:

- number and origin (for example, conference presentation, journal article) of the items
- emergence of a set of interconnected organising curriculum principles
- emergence of generational approaches to conceptualising the student FYE
- institutional level (for example, subject, program, faculty etc.)
- student group of focus (for example, equity groups).

2000–2003: The major focus of this period was on isolated or ‘siloes’ *first generation* co-curricular activities, particularly orientation and peer mentoring, along with programs and strategies, all designed to assist students to make the transition from previous to university educational experiences. In addition, psychometrically-based investigations of the influence of individual personal and learning characteristics on transition behaviours were common along with, to a lesser extent, explorations of the expectations–reality nexus. Also, there was some evidence of *second generation* approaches. Considering the literature as a whole, it was essentially exploratory, optimistic and future-oriented but generally reflecting a series of isolated events that were subject, program or faculty based.

¹ The two names Aotearoa and New Zealand are used jointly and interchangeably in this manuscript.

2004–2007: In Australia this period was bookended by the *user-pays* legacy of the Howard Government in the late nineties and the Bradley focus on widening participation from 2008 on, while in Aotearoa, it was a time when the distinct role of higher education within a differentiated tertiary sector was being reconsidered. 2004–2007 was highlighted by both quantitative and qualitative changes in the literature but was still essentially subject, program or faculty based. While first generation co-curricular activities were still prevalent, they were subtly more sophisticated. However, they were overshadowed by a dominant second generation literature that reflected a student-centred philosophy underpinned by the emergent First Year Curriculum Principles (FYCPs) of *Design, Engagement* and *Assessment*, and evidence of the beginnings of cross-institutional cooperation involving academic and professional staff. Although there was a distinct and, we would submit, a positive difference between the literature of the early years of the decade and this middle period, there was a tentativeness in this period as reflected in the pilot nature of many of the programs. Of significance, however, was the introduction and defining of the term *transition pedagogy*, which provided the opportunity to move beyond the second generation approach to understanding the FYE.

2008–2010: There was a dramatic increase in the amount of FYE literature available in this period, primarily due to an exponential increase in second generation activities, mainly in specific curriculum-focused approaches, many subject based, and aimed at facilitating student engagement and staff development. Promoting student engagement by utilising and clarifying expectations and monitoring student at-risk behaviour emerged as significant areas of interest, particularly in 2009–2010, where attention in Australia was focused on the widening participation agenda, and in New Zealand on realigning higher education with social and economic policy. These issues reflected growth in a university-wide focus for research along with a more explicit focus on non-traditional and equity cohorts. Serious attempts to operationalise the *third generation* approach to cater for the FYE through a transition pedagogy—an institution-wide holistic and coordinated approach to supporting first year students—highlighted the end of the period under review.

This review is testament to the fact that the study of the FYE is now well established in Australasia as a focus for research and evidence-based practice. Further, the FYE movement is *on the cusp* and ready for more sophisticated research such as inter-professional teams implementing institution-wide projects. While the *Transition, Design* and *Engagement* FYCPs are being addressed reasonably well, there is potential for activities applying the *Diversity, Assessment*, and *Evaluation and monitoring* principles. As useful as the generational classification has been to conceptualising FYE, there is a potentially richer alternative available in a Capability Maturity Model that would facilitate studies both between institutions within a sector and between sectors. These aspects provide the challenges and the opportunities for FYE adherents, both scholars and practitioners, to grapple with in the next decade.



Acronyms

ALTC	Australian Learning and Teaching Council
AUSSE	Australasian Survey of Student Engagement
CMM	Capability Maturity Model
CRA	Criterion-referenced assessment
CSHE	Centre for the Study of Higher Education
DEEWR	Department of Education, Employment and Workplace Relations
EAL	English as an additional language
FYCP	First Year Curriculum Principle
FYE	First year experience
FYHE	First year in higher education
ICT	Information and communication technology
LSES	Lower socio-economic status
NESB	Non-English speaking background
PALS	Peer-assisted learning strategy
PASS	Peer-assisted study session
SI	Supplemental instruction
SSP	Student Success Project
TAFE	Technical and further education
TES	Tertiary Education Strategy
VLE	Virtual learning environment

Downloaded Copy



Contents

Preface.....	i
Foreword.....	iii
Executive summary	v
Acronyms	vii
Chapter 1: Contextualising the review	1
An Australasian sector.....	2
Defining the review	2
Defining first year.....	2
Defining the literature.....	3
Defining the period of the review.....	3
Defining the parameters of the review	4
Theoretical construct 1: First Year Curriculum Principles	4
Theoretical construct 2: Generational approaches to the first year experience.....	5
Identifying the constructs	5
Dividing the decade	5
Review statistics	6
Summary tables.....	6
The literature reviewed.....	7
The First Year Curriculum Principles.....	8
The generational approaches to the first year experience.....	9
The focus of research activity	10
Integrating the literature, principles and approaches in a sociopolitical context.....	11
What the review is and what it is not	12
Structure of the discussions	12
Chapter 2: Discussion of the literature: 2000–2003.....	13
Literature of influence and/or interest	13
Within the scope of the review	13
Outside the scope of the review.....	14
Discussion of the literature	14
Orientation.....	14
Peer programs	14
Other programs and strategies.....	15
Students’ individual characteristics.....	15
Generational approaches	16
Some issues related to research design and future perspective	16
Summary of the 2000–2003 period	17

Chapter 3: Discussion of the literature: 2004–2007	19
Literature of influence and/or interest	19
Within the scope of the review	19
Outside the scope of the review	20
Discussion of the literature	20
Qualitative changes in existing emphases	20
New emphases	21
An increase in second generation approaches and FYCPs	21
An emergence of third generation approaches	22
Summary of the 2004–2007 period	24
Chapter 4: Discussion of the literature: 2008–2010	25
Literature of influence and/or interest	25
Within the scope of the review	25
Outside the scope of the review	26
Discussion of the literature	27
The emergence of the Engagement principle	27
The impact of various factors on student engagement	27
Information and communication technologies	27
Curriculum-related activities	28
Staff development	29
The articulation of the engagement construct	30
Expectations	30
At-risk students	31
Other ongoing issues	32
Co-curricular activities	32
Students' individual characteristics	33
Generational approaches	33
Widening participation	34
Summary of the 2008–2010 period	35
Chapter 5: Learning from the literature	37
Prediction versus practice	38
Concerns	38
Future research	39
Diversity	39
Comparative studies	40
Longitudinal studies	40
Teaching, learning and assessment	40
Focus on the curriculum	40
Other topics	41

Summarising.....	41
The relatively underutilised FYCPs	41
Comparative research	41
Longitudinal research.....	41
Transition pedagogy.....	42
What has been learned?.....	42
Where to from here?.....	44
And finally	47
References	49
Appendix 1: Source of literature items.....	77
Appendix 2: Equity groups	91

Downloaded Copy

Downloaded Copy



Chapter 1

Contextualising the review

There is a complexity of inter-related reasons for undertaking this review of first year experience (FYE) literature from Australasia—here defined as Australia and Aotearoa/New Zealand. Using the Everest analogy, the literature is there but has not yet been comprehensively summarised. The rationale for the Australasian focus was identified nearly a decade ago by K. Walker (2001, p. 21) who, although writing in the Australian context, made comments equally valid for the New Zealand situation at that time when he noted that:

... the work of Australian-based investigations is essential to the development of student orientation and success activities within the Australian tertiary context. While the work of researchers from the northern hemisphere can contribute to activities in Australian higher education, there are also significant differences between the university cultures of North America and Australia. The most apparent differences between the two tertiary contexts are the selection processes of a student into a university or college as well as the significant numbers of residential students in North American universities and colleges compared to the largely commuter-based student populations of Australian universities. Hence investigations based in one culture need careful translation and interpretation to be of value to another culture. Locally developed investigations that provide an Australian perspective eliminate the need for such cultural re-interpretation by practitioners. It increases the immediacy and relevance of findings to student support personnel in Australian universities.

These sentiments were echoed around the same time by McInnis (2001) and Darlaston-Jones et al. (2001) with the latter observing ‘the fact that much of the available research is based on the North American experience and the findings do not necessarily equate to the ... [Australasian] context’ (p. 1).

A review of Australasian literature complements existing literature reviews emerging out of North America (for example, Pascarella & Terenzini, 2004) and the United Kingdom (UK) (for example, Harvey, Drew, & Smith, 2006; Yorke & Longden, 2004). The Pascarella and Terenzini review was essentially US-centric, but Harvey et al., in their extensive review of 545 citations from many countries (the number of which are unspecified but with the criterion of the items being published in English), had close to 10% (54, 9.9%) with an Australasian focus. While this was a reasonable coverage, it was not a comprehensive review due to the authors’ broad international focus. Other useful and informative reviews out of New Zealand (Prebble et al., 2004;² Zepke & Leach, 2005, 2010a; Zepke et al., 2005) and the UK (Yorke & Longden)³ were again restricted by the breadth of their international focus—Zepke and Leach (2010a), for example, canvassed material from 10 countries,⁴ while Yorke and Longden focused on Australia, South Africa and the UK. The quinquennial reports from the Centre for the Study of Higher Education (CSHE) at the University of Melbourne on the FYE in Australian universities, which built on data first reported prior to 2000 (McInnis, James, & McNaught, 1995), provide excellent snapshots of student experience in 2000 (McInnis, James, & Hartley, 2000), 2005 (Krause, Hartley, James, & McInnis, 2005) and 2010 (James, Krause, & Jennings, 2010) and invaluable longitudinal trend

² This review has been further synthesised by Rivers (2005).

³ This document follows the APA formatting convention of not repeating the year of a citation within a paragraph unless there is the potential for confusion, for example, two different citations for the same author(s)—such as Zepke and Leach (2005, 2010a) above.

⁴ The United States, the United Kingdom, Australia, New Zealand, South Africa, Spain, South Korea, Israel, China and France.

meta-analyses across the 1995–2010 period.⁵ They also act as useful anchors around which this review can be structured. Existing reviews focusing on the Australian context (for example, McInnis, Hartley, Polesel, & Teese, 2000) provide a starting point for this work.

The review is also timely in the shared global and Australasian sociopolitical context of a focus on widening participation and student attainment. Particularly, the current state of FYE research and practice in Australasia suggests a climate of readiness for meta-analysis given the exponential growth in activity and interest in the FYE both quantitatively and qualitatively (Kift, 2008), which makes it worthy of consideration as a literature independent from, though part of, the broader higher education literature. After more than a decade of an increasingly successful Pacific Rim First Year in Higher Education Conference (see <http://www.fyhe.com.au>) and the 2010 launch of a dedicated journal, the *International Journal of the First Year in Higher Education* (see <https://www.fyhe.com.au/journal/index.php/intjfyhe>), the first year movement in Australasia is *on the cusp*, having started to move from isolated individual activities to more holistic integrated institution-wide applications. Therefore, it is important that the movement has consensual direction and focus that can be facilitated by a shared understanding of the context as manifested through the literature.

An Australasian sector

This review has treated the literature arising from the New Zealand and Australian contexts as a unified body of work that has appeared over the past decade and focuses on the complexity of the student experience in higher education and the initiatives taken within contemporary settings to enhance their experiences. This may imply that the higher education sectors in the two countries are the same; however, this is not quite the case.

The sectors in Aotearoa and Australia differ in terms of structure, governance and scale. In Australia, tertiary education consists of two sectors: vocational education, most of which occurs in institutes of technical and further education (TAFE); and higher education, which involves three groupings of institutions—the public universities, other self-accrediting

institutions (for example, the Australian Maritime College and Batchelor Institute) and state- and territory-accredited institutions. The activities of these institutions are governed by a single act, the *Higher Education Support Act 2003*, with administrative responsibility sitting with the Australian Government Department of Education, Employment and Workplace Relations (DEEWR).

There are 38 public universities in Australia, five of which are known as dual sector institutions in that they incorporate a TAFE and a university within the one organisation and offer programs at diploma level and above. In New Zealand, there is a single tertiary sector that includes all institutions offering post-secondary education. The groups of institutions are the eight universities, three wānanga (Māori centres of tertiary learning), institutes of technology and polytechnics (the equivalent of the Australian TAFE sector), industry training organisations, private training establishments, and adult and community education. The tertiary sector is governed by the *Education Act 1989* and administrative responsibility rests with the Tertiary Education Commission. Another difference relates to the use of the term *regional*, which in Aotearoa is used to mean a geographical area including the major cities and towns located within that area, while in Australia it is used to describe universities that are located outside the major metropolitan cities. Despite these differences, both countries regard *higher education* to focus on post-secondary knowledge production in the form of education and research that takes place within universities.

Defining the review

Defining first year

Despite its limitations, the definition of *first year* used in this review was subjective and lay with the authors of the items of literature reviewed. Rarely, if ever, did the authors provide a definition, presumably assuming that the reader knew what it meant! If information had been provided, it may have been possible to have had a more tightly controlled definition such as, for example, *less than or equal to a number of credit points or subjects equivalent to one year full-time enrolment*. However, this was not possible and definitions consisted of phrases such as *first year*, *Year 1* and *commencing students*. Hence, the definition used in this review is an inclusive one that also takes into account the shifting focus of what it means to be a first year student. The literature search was not deliberately limited to undergraduate students, but it revealed an

⁵ The literature reviews and the quinquennial studies cited here are important documents and provide considerable insights into students' FYE. As they are already comprehensive, they are not reviewed in detail throughout this review. They are, however, cited where relevant as documents of importance.

almost exclusive preoccupation by investigators with that mode with only one reference to postgraduate students emerging (Asmar & Peseta, 2001).

Defining the literature

No literature review can be completely exhaustive. In the words of experienced reviewers, 'there is always more literature than is found or used' (Zepke & Leach, 2010a, p. 3), pragmatically resulting in, at best, a 'comprehensive rather than exhaustive approach' (Harvey et al., 2006, p. 7). The aim here was to strive to be at least representative. The scope of the literature was defined by the criteria that it:

1. Focused on first year, however defined, and
2. Be Australasian, dealing with empirical reports or conceptual discussions about persons, institutions or the higher education sector in Australasia, and
3. Covered the period 2000–2010.

The search process was deliberate rather than random, and targeted presentations and publications in journals, conferences, monographs and reports, both Australasian and overseas, that had:

- an *explicit* focus on higher education, for example, *Higher Education Research & Development* and the Higher Education Research and Development Society of Australasia Conference, or
- a focus on education in general, for example, the *Australian Journal of Education* and the joint New Zealand Association for Research in Education/Australian Association for Research in Education Conference, or
- a discipline or professional focus, for example, *Research in Science Education* and the Australasian Association for Engineering Education Conference.

The outcome of this process defined the literature as two sets of items:

- *Within the scope of the review*
Those items that were dated between 2000 and 2010 inclusive and were either
 - reviewed and included in the discussion
 or
 - not reviewed but deemed to be literature of influence and/or interest, for example, the quinquennial CSHE reports.

- *Outside the scope of the review*

Those items that were one or more of the following:

- dated outside the 2000–2010 range but deemed to be literature of influence and/or interest, for example, the review *Transition from secondary to tertiary: A performance study* by Pargetter et al. (1999)
- not Australasian in focus but deemed to be literature of influence and/or interest, for example, the Scottish *Quality enhancement themes* (The Quality Assurance Agency for Higher Education Scotland, 2008)
- used to enhance the discussion, for example, a psychometric data collection instrument such as Spielberger's State-Trait Anxiety Inventory (Spielberger, Gorsuch, Lushene, Vagg, & Jacobs, 1983).

Both sets of items were relevant to defining the literature and are both included in the document but reported differently. The bibliographic details of all items canvassed are available in the References section. The *within the scope* items are also listed separately in author(s)–year format in Appendix 1. The sources of these items (for example, a specific conference) and the number of items from each source are also shown in Appendix 1.

Defining the period of the review

The period of the review runs from 2000 to 2010, loosely referred to in the discussion as a decade.⁶ There were a number of reasons why the decision to canvass the literature across this decade was made. The starting point was 2000 because:

- 2000 was regarded as the beginning of the new millennium.
- In 2000, the New Zealand government established the Tertiary Education Advisory Committee, which was tasked with providing advice on the long-term strategic direction for their entire tertiary sector (New Zealand Ministry of Education, 2006, p. 37).
- The second of the quinquennial CSHE reports on the FYE in Australian universities was published in 2000 (McInnis, James, et al., 2000). These reports had their genesis in the McInnis et al. (1995) study.

⁶ Strictly speaking, the decade runs from 2001–2010, but the popular interpretation of 2000–2010 has been used here. This is akin to the storm in a teacup debate that occurred late last century as to whether the new millennium began on 1 January 2000 or 1 January 2001, the latter being literally correct but the former being the popular choice.

- At the end of the previous century, transition into higher education was seen not only as an emerging area of interest, but also as one of considerable importance to the sector (Pargetter et al., 1999; K. Walker, 2001). Indeed, at the beginning of the millennium, McInnis (2001) exhorted that ‘addressing the problems and pitfalls facing students in the initial days and weeks of their undergraduate course ... had assumed some urgency as more students commenced university study from more diverse academic backgrounds and levels of preparation’ (p. 105).

Terminating the review at 2010 was a pragmatic decision designed to maximise the amount of potential literature while acknowledging the need to produce the report as soon as possible, given the earlier assertion that the first year movement in Australasia is currently *on the cusp*. Fortuitously, 2010 also marked the boundary between the existing (2007–2012) and a new (2010–2015) Tertiary Education Strategy (TES) in New Zealand (Cullen, 2007), and the fourth quinquennial report about the FYE of Australian students was published (James et al., 2010).

Defining the parameters of the review

Two theoretical constructs were used during the literature search to provide parameters for the search and to provide factors around which the discussion could be structured. They are discussed briefly below.

Theoretical construct 1: First Year Curriculum Principles

In this work, curriculum has been conceptualised very broadly to encompass:

... the totality of the undergraduate student experience of, and engagement with, their new program of tertiary study. “Curriculum” in this sense includes all of the academic, social and support aspects of the student experience, focuses on the “educational conditions in which we place students” (Tinto, 2009, p. 2), and includes the co-curricular opportunities offered (outside the formal curriculum) with which students are encouraged to engage.

(Kift, 2009a, p. 9)

For details of the First Year Curriculum Principles (FYCPs), see Australian Learning and Teaching Council (ALTC, 2009a); Kift (2009a); and Kift, Nelson, and Clarke (2010), but briefly:

Good first year curriculum design should abide by the following interconnected organising principles to facilitate all students fully achieving desired learning outcomes.

Transition: The curriculum and its delivery should be designed to be consistent and explicit in assisting students’ transition from their previous educational experience to the nature of learning in higher education and learning in their discipline as part of their lifelong learning. The first year curriculum should be designed to mediate and support transition as a process that occurs over time. In this way, the first year curriculum will enable successful student transition into first year, through first year, into later years and ultimately out into the world of work, professional practice and career attainment.

Diversity: The first year curriculum should be attuned to student diversity and must be accessible by, and inclusive of, all students. First year curriculum design should recognise that students have special learning needs by reason of their social, cultural and academic transition. Diversity is often a factor that further exacerbates transition difficulties. The first year curriculum should take into account students’ backgrounds, needs, experiences and patterns of study, and few if any assumptions should be made about existing skills and knowledge. ‘Diversity’ in this context includes, for example:

- *membership of at-risk or equity groups*
- *widening participation (for example, non-traditional cohorts)*
- *students’ existing skills and knowledge*
- *patterns and timing of engagement with the first year curriculum (for example, mid-year entry).*

Design: First year curriculum design and delivery should be learning-focussed, explicit and relevant in providing the foundation and scaffolding necessary for first year learning success. This requires that the curriculum must be designed to assist student development and to support their engagement with learning environments through the intentional integration and sequencing of knowledge, skills, and attitudes.

Engagement: Learning, teaching, and assessment approaches in the first year curriculum should enact an engaging and involving curriculum pedagogy and should enable active and collaborative learning. Learning communities should be promoted through the embedding in first year curriculum of active and interactive learning opportunities and other opportunities for peer-to-peer collaboration and teacher-student interaction.

Assessment: The first year curriculum should assist students to make a successful transition to assessment in higher education, while assessment should increase in complexity from the first to later years of curriculum design. Critically, students should receive regular, formative evaluations of their work early in their program of study to aid their learning and to provide feedback to both students and staff on student progress and achievement.

Evaluation and monitoring: Good first year curriculum design is evidence-based and enhanced by regular evaluation that leads to curriculum development and renewal designed to improve student learning. The first year curriculum should also have strategies embedded to monitor all students' engagement in their learning and to identify and intervene in a timely way with students at risk of not succeeding or fully achieving desired learning outcomes.

(Kift, 2009a, pp. 40–41)

Theoretical construct 2: Generational approaches to the first year experience

Details of the generational approach to defining first year experiences can be found in K. Wilson (2009), ALTC (2009a, 2009b), Kift (2009a), and Kift et al. (2010), but briefly and taken from Kift et al. (2010, pp. 10–11):

In this classification, first generation approaches focus on co-curricular initiatives—strategies such as support services, learning support, orientation and peer programs, academic advising, social activities, enrichment programs (K. Wilson, 2009, p. 10). There is general agreement across the sector nationally and internationally as to what constitutes co-curricular activities and hence a first generation approach. Although there is also consensus that second generation approaches focus on curriculum, this has been variously interpreted. K. Wilson (2009) presents the second generation approach as consisting of specific curriculum-related activities and strategies: “the core practices of education (e.g., teaching quality, course design, etc.) [with] common examples including engaging course and assessment design, formative assessment tasks, and community building in the classroom” (p. 10). Kift (2009a), using the broad definition of curriculum posited earlier, defines the second generation approach to the FYE as an integrated holistic approach consisting of intentionally blended curricular and co-curricular activities which “focus squarely on enhancing the student learning experience through pedagogy, curriculum design, and learning and teaching practice in the physical and virtual classroom” (Kift, 2009a, p. 1). The third generation approach is characterized by Lizzio (ALTC, 2009b) as “a coordinated whole of institution partnership and consistent message

about the first year experience across the university” (p. 14) but perhaps more explicitly and operationally by Kift (2009a, p. 1):

A third generation FYE approach is a further collaborative and strategic leap again that requires whole-of-institution transformation. This optimal approach will only occur when first generation co-curricular and second generation curricular approaches are brought together in a comprehensive, integrated, and coordinated strategy that delivers a seamless FYE across an entire institution and all of its disciplines, programs, and services. Third generation strategies will require an institutional vision for the FYE that is shared by academic and professional staff who form sustainable partnerships across institutional boundaries to ensure its enactment.

Identifying the constructs

The existence of instances of FYCPs and generational approaches have had to be *implied* as each item of literature was reviewed. This was done by two of the authors first independently and then collaboratively determining the inference, leading to a final decision. Items of literature often had more than one instance of a FYCP or generational approach assigned to them, depending on their complexity. For example, Jardine (2005), exploring factors influencing student persistence, identified as significant peer networks (first generation) and embedded academic skills development programs (second generation). Also, the existence of the FYCPs of Transition and Design were able to be implied in that study.

Dividing the decade

As with defining the decade, there were again pragmatic and substantive reasons for dividing it into year clusters. The pragmatic reason was that, in order to identify trends, several years needed to be considered together to provide a substantial amount of literature. The substantive reasons were sociopolitical. There were several key developments in Aotearoa and Australia during the decade that highlighted key and pivotal years in terms of potential influence on the tertiary sector.

In the early part of the decade, the newly elected New Zealand Labour Government, concerned about the high costs to students and the lack of alignment of the tertiary sector with the country's needs (M. McLaughlin, 2003), set out its reform agenda which included: amendments to the Education Act in 2001; enactment of the Tertiary Reform Bill and the release of the first five-year

TES⁷ in 2002; and the establishment of the Tertiary Education Commission in 2003. The period of 2004 to 2007 was characterised by significant growth in participation across the tertiary sector, including increased participation in programs at bachelor level and above (New Zealand Ministry of Education, 2006). Towards the end of this period, there was recognition of the need to refocus on increasing the participation of Māori and Pasifika students, students with disabilities, and supporting the transition from school to tertiary for students from lower socio-economic status (LSES) backgrounds (pp. 72–73). The 2008–2010 period was presided over by TES-2 (2007–2012), which sought to ‘drive the transformation of New Zealand into a high wage, knowledge-based economy’ (Cullen, 2006, p. 2). This TES (TES-2), specifically aimed to increase the achievement of under-represented groups at bachelors level and above, was accompanied by significant new funding for universities (Cullen, 2007).

In Australia, the decade was first punctuated by the 2003–2004 period when it was impacted by manifestations of a user-pays ideology originally mooted in the Howard Government’s earlier review by West (1998). The recommendations were not adopted in 1998 as they were regarded as ‘too politically hazardous at the time’ (Gale & Tranter, 2011, p. 39). West’s ideas reappeared four years later in Australian Government Minister Brendon Nelson’s review and policy documents—*Higher education at the crossroads* (B. Nelson, 2002) and *Our universities: Backing Australia’s future* (B. Nelson, 2003). Second, the Bradley Report (Bradley, Noonan, Nugent, & Scales, 2008) and the government response (DEEWR, 2009) stimulated immense interest in FYE activities in the latter years of the decade. Complementing this impact was the first of the Australasian Study of Student Engagement (AUSSE) survey data collections and consequent reports, which have occurred annually since 2007.

Consequently, the decade was divided into 2000–2003, 2004–2007 and 2008–2010.

Review statistics

Summary tables

The tables summarise the 399 items of literature classified as *within the scope of the review*. Tables 1 to 4 show the distribution across the years of:

- the items of literature reviewed (Table 1)
- the inferred instances of FYCPs (Table 2)
- the inferred instances of generational approaches to the FYE (Table 3)
- the institutional level and student group of focus (Table 4).

Table 5 is a synthesis of the data in Tables 1 to 3.

Each table includes summaries for each year, for each of the three clusters of years and for the total period from 2000 to 2010. Some general comments about the data are made here with more detailed observations in the discussion of the literature that follows in Chapters 2, 3 and 4. As noted earlier, the number of instances of both the FYCPs and the generational approaches can exceed the number of literature items reviewed as any given item may show evidence of more than one principle or approach.

⁷ For convenience, this TES, operating from 2002–2007 is labelled TES-1 and the subsequent one, operating from 2007–2012, as TES-2. As indicated earlier, there is a ‘TES-3’ (2010–2015) that overlaps TES-2.

The literature reviewed

A detailed analysis of the literature reviewed showing the specific conferences, journals and other publications canvassed is available in Table 6 in Appendix 1, while a collated summary is shown here in Table 1. The data in Table 1 indicate that just over half of the literature items were conference presentations (207/399, 51.9%) with most of the remainder—one-third of the total—being publications (133/399, 33.3%). This approximate half/one-third split was relatively constant across the decade, but there was quite a dramatic increase in absolute terms of the quantity of FYE literature in the latter years.

Table 1: Items of literature by year

Items of literature				
YEAR	Conference papers	Publications (journals, books)	Other (reports, theses)	TOTAL
2000	11	10	2	23
2001	7	14	0	21
2002	17	6	4	27
2003	15	5	2	22
Total	50	35	8	93
%	53.8	37.6	8.6	100.0
2004	10	9	3	22
2005	12	13	7	32
2006	17	7	6	30
2007	15	10	6	31
Total	54	39	22	115
%	47.0	33.9	19.1	100.0
2008	16	14	9	39
2009	47	23	8	78
2010	40	22	12	74
Total	103	59	29	191
%	53.9	30.9	15.2	100.0
TOTAL	207	133	59	399
%	51.9	33.3	14.8	100.0

The First Year Curriculum Principles

The distribution of the FYCPs across the years is summarised in Table 2. Some interesting aspects of the data are that:

- around one-third of the incidences was about the Transition principle (246/717, 34.3%)
- the incidence of the Engagement principle increased dramatically during the 2008–2010 period
- the Transition, Design and Engagement principles accounted for almost three-quarters of the incidences (532/717, 74.2%), and hence
- the Diversity, Assessment, and Evaluation and monitoring principles were dealt with relatively sparsely in the literature.

Table 2: First Year Curriculum Principles by year

Instances of First Year Curriculum Principles							
YEAR	Transition	Diversity	Design	Engagement	Assessment	Evaluation and monitoring	TOTAL
2000	23	4	5	7	2	4	45
2001	21	4	4	8	3	2	42
2002	20	10	8	2	4	2	46
2003	17	7	5	5	3	3	40
Total	81	25	22	22	12	11	173
%	46.8	13.2	13.9	12.7	7.3	7.3	100.0
2004	17	4	6	8	3	6	44
2005	14	2	14	9	13	3	55
2006	16	9	13	10	8	4	60
2007	19	9	13	9	5	1	56
Total	66	24	46	36	29	14	215
%	30.7	11.2	21.4	16.7	13.5	6.5	100.0
2008	19	6	16	14	7	5	67
2009	52	15	30	38	5	8	148
2010	28	10	25	37	8	6	144
Total	99	31	71	89	20	19	329
%	30.1	9.4	21.6	27.1	6.1	5.8	100.0
TOTAL	246	80	139	147	61	44	717
%	34.3	11.2	19.4	20.5	8.5	6.1	100.0

The generational approaches to the first year experience

The distribution of first, second and third generation approaches to organising students' first year experience is summarised in Table 3. The most striking features of the data are:

- the pattern of the application of first generation approaches across the years—constant in absolute terms (63, 66, 70) but decreasing proportionately (55.3%, 44.3%, 32.6%), relative mainly to the increasing instances of the second generation approaches
- the consistent increase in the occurrence of the second generation approach across the years, and particularly post-Bradley/TES-2⁸ (2009, 2010)
- the dramatic increase in the occurrence of the third generation approach in the post-Bradley/TES-2 years of 2009 and 2010.

Table 3: Generational approaches by year

Instances of approaches				
YEAR	First generation	Second generation	Third generation	TOTAL
2000	20	10	1	31
2001	14	11	2	27
2002	12	17	2	31
2003	17	8	0	25
Total	63	46	5	114
%	55.3	40.4	4.9	100.0
2004	19	11	0	30
2005	13	26	3	42
2006	16	24	0	40
2007	18	17	2	37
Total	66	78	5	149
%	44.3	52.3	3.4	100.0
2008	12	30	2	44
2009	37	45	9	91
2010	21	54	5	80
Total	70	129	16	215
%	32.6	60.0	7.4	100.0
TOTAL	199	253	26	478
%	41.6	52.9	5.4	100.0

⁸ This is being introduced as a convenient way of referring to the Bradley Report in Australia and the second Tertiary Education Strategy in New Zealand, and the possible impact they had on university policies and procedures and researcher-practitioner interest and focus.

The focus of research activity

Table 4 summarises the focus of the research in each item of literature. Two different types of information are presented:

- Institutional level—whether the research was carried out at a subject, program,⁹ faculty or university level.
- Student group—whether the focus of the research was a specific group (that is, Australian Indigenous, Māori, Pasifika, people with a disability, LSES, mature age, English as an additional language [EAL], rural) or first year students in general (for example, all commencing students, students enrolled at a new campus). A detailed breakdown of the references to the non-traditional or equity groups is available in Table 7 in Appendix 2.

Table 4: Institutional and student focus of research by year

YEAR	Institutional focus					Student focus		
	Subject	Program	Faculty	University	TOTAL	FY non-traditional or equity groups	FY students in general	TOTAL
2000	4	3	4	3	14	2	12	14
2001	1	7	5	3	16	2	10	12
2002	3	7	4	1	15	4	10	14
2003	1	4	7	1	13	1	14	15
Total	9	21	20	8	58	9	46	55
%	15.5	36.2	34.5	13.8	100.0	14.8	83.6	100.0
2004	3	1	4	2	10	2	13	15
2005	10	6	1	2	19	2	16	18
2006	7	6	2	5	20	6	16	22
2007	3	7	11	3	24	8	11	19
Total	23	20	18	12	73	18	56	74
%	31.5	27.4	24.7	16.4	100.0	24.3	75.7	100.0
2008	11	7	8	7	33	8	12	20
2009	13	13	14	13	53	13	27	40
2010	13	7	9	21	50	18	25	43
Total	37	27	31	41	136	39	64	103
%	27.2	19.9	22.8	30.1	100.0	37.9	62.1	100.0
TOTAL	69	68	69	61	267	66	166	232
%	25.8	25.5	25.8	22.8	100.0	28.4	71.6	100.0

With regard to the institutional levels, the overall distribution shows a similar emphasis on subject, course, faculty and university focus—all around 25%—but this generalisation masks the differential emphases across the decade. During 2000–2003, the focus was more on the program (21/58, 36.2%) or faculty (20/58, 34.5%) levels; in the 2004–2007 period, on the subject level (23/73; 31.5%); and in the 2008–2010 period, on subject (37/136, 27.2%) and university (41/136; 30.1%) levels. It is worth noting, however, that two-thirds of the university level research occurred in the 2008–2010 period (41/61, 67.2%), particularly 2010.

⁹ A *subject* is a generic term used throughout the review to refer to a semester-long teaching activity. It is synonymous with ‘unit,’ ‘course’ or ‘paper,’ all four terms being used across Australasian higher education institutions. A *program* is a collection of subjects leading to an award such as a Bachelor of Applied Science with the synonym of ‘course’.

Focusing on student groups:

- Studies of first year groups in general dominated (166/232, 71.6%) and were relatively constant across the decade. Typical studies explored the perceptions and behaviour of students enrolled on a new campus (for example, C. Smith, Isaacs, Holzi, Herbert, & Roulston, 2000) or reported on the development and application of a transition program for all commencing students (for example, Skene, 2003).
- Studies with an explicit focus on non-traditional or equity groups were limited (66/232, 28.4%) with the major activity occurring during the 2008–2010—the Bradley and post-Bradley/TES-2 period with widening participation on the agenda. The relatively small number of studies is a reflection of the limited instances of the Diversity FYCP.

Integrating the literature, principles and approaches in a sociopolitical context

An integrated summary of Tables 1, 2 and 3 is shown in Table 5.

Table 5: Summarising the parameters

YEAR	Sociopolitical context	Items	Generational approaches				Principles						
			First	Second	Third	TOTAL	Transition	Diversity	Design	Engagement	Assessment	Evaluation and monitoring	TOTAL
2000	McInnis, James, et al., 2000	23	20	10	1	31	23	4	5	7	2	4	45
2001		21	14	11	2	27	21	4	4	8	3	2	42
2002	B. Nelson, 2002	27	12	17	2	31	20	10	8	2	4	2	46
2003	B. Nelson, 2003; M. McLaughlin, 2003	22	17	8	0	25	17	7	5	5	3	3	40
Total		93	63	46	5	114	81	25	22	22	12	11	173
2004		22	19	11	0	30	17	4	6	8	3	6	44
2005	Krause et al., 2005; Ra. Walker, 2005 ¹⁰	32	13	26	3	41	14	2	14	9	13	3	55
2006	NZ Ministry of Edn, 2006	30	16	24	0	41	16	9	13	10	8	4	60
2007	AUSSE begins*	31	18	17	2	37	19	9	13	9	5	1	56
Total		115	66	78	5	149	66	24	46	36	29	14	215
2008	Bradley et al., 2008	39	12	30	2	44	19	6	16	14	7	5	67
2009	Aust. Govt, 2009	78	37	45	9	91	52	15	30	38	5	8	148
2010	James et al., 2010	74	21	54	5	80	28	10	25	37	8	6	114
Total		191	70	129	16	215	99	31	71	89	20	19	329
TOTAL		399	199	253	26	478	246	80	139	147	61	44	717

* First (of annual) AUSSE data collection and reporting.

¹⁰ 'Ra' (Ranginui) is necessary to differentiate the author in this citation from another author 'Re' (Rebecca) Walker.

What the review is and what it is not

Because this is the first major review of Australasian FYE literature for over a decade since the reviews of Pargetter et al. (1999) and McInnis, Hartley, et al. (2000), it is consequently a sometimes quite dense *descriptive summary* of topics. It provides an overview of the issues that have dominated the FYE scene since 2000 but, apart from the meta-analytic observations in Chapter 5, does not provide an in-depth critique or evaluative discussion of the particular topics identified. Individuals and institutions are encouraged to use the synthesised literature as a starting point for developing their own critiques. However, subsequent titles in this series will focus on specific aspects that have emerged from the literature and will carry out in-depth evaluative critiques of the research and evidence-based practice.

Structure of the discussions

For each of the three year clusters—2000–2003 (Chapter 2), 2004–2007 (Chapter 3) and 2008–2010 (Chapter 4)—the discussion follows the same format of:

- an introductory quantitative overview of the items of literature and instances of FYCPs, generational approaches, institutional levels and student groups
- a listing of the items of literature that may either have had an *influence* on FYE activities (and consequently the type of literature produced) or are of *interest* in reflecting the mood and focus of FYE activities in that period. As discussed in Chapter 1, these items may be *within* or *outside the scope* of the literature and year range
- a discussion of the literature.

The final chapter, Chapter 5, synthesises the discussions from Chapters 2, 3 and 4 by comparing the outcomes with predictions made by McInnis (2001) early in the decade and deriving a series of meta-observations of the information. The chapter and the review concludes with suggestions for future FYE activities and research.



Chapter 2

Discussion of the literature: 2000–2003

The extensive summary of Australian-based research provided by Pargetter et al. (1999) was interpreted shortly afterwards as showing ‘frantic activity in the closing decade of the old millennium’ (K. Walker, 2001, p. 21) and highlighted transition into higher education as an area of considerable importance to the sector and therefore worthy of investigation. This was reinforced by McInnis, Hartley, et al. (2000) who concluded that, in universities, ‘the management of transition to the first year is increasingly becoming a major activity since it is now understood that the effort invested in the early years reduces the likelihood of problems leading to non-completion in later years’ (p. 2). Chapter 2 tells the story of that investment in the 2000–2003 years.

As identified in Tables 1 to 5 for the year cluster 2000–2003:

- Ninety-three items of literature were reviewed, more than half being conference presentations (50/93, 53.8%). The remainder were mainly publications—journal articles and book chapters—(35/93, 37.6%), along with seven reports/reviews and one thesis (8/93, 8.6%).
- Of the 173 inferred instances of FYCPs, close to half referred to the Transition principle (81/173, 46.8%).
- There were 114 inferred instances of approaches catering for the FYE, and first generation approaches dominated with over half of the instances (63/114, 55.3%). However, second generation approaches were also quite frequent (46/114, 40.4%), particularly in 2002 (17 cases).
- Reports were either program, faculty or, to a lesser extent, subject based (a total of 50/58, 86.2%) and focused mainly on commencing students as a general group (46/54, 85.2%), rather than specific non-traditional or equity cohorts (8/54, 14.8%).

Literature of influence and/or interest

Within the scope of the review

- James, R. (2002). Students’ changing expectations of higher education and the consequences of mismatches with reality. *Responding to student expectations* (pp. 71–83). Paris, France: OECD Publications.
- McInnis, C. (2001). Researching the first year experience: Where to from here? *Higher Education Research & Development*, 20(2), 105–114. doi: 10.1080/07294360125188
- McInnis, C., James, R., & Hartley, R. (2000). *Trends in the first year experience in Australian universities*. Melbourne, Australia: Centre for the Study of Higher Education, The University of Melbourne.
- Nelson, B. (2002). *Higher education at the crossroads: An overview paper*. Canberra, Australia: Commonwealth of Australia.
- Nelson, B. (2003). *Our universities: Backing Australia’s future*. Canberra, Australia: Commonwealth of Australia.
- Pitkethly, A., & Prosser, M. (2001). The First Year Experience Project: A model for university-wide change. *Higher Education Research & Development*, 20(2), 185–198. doi: 10.1080/758483470
- Swing, R. (2003, June–July). *First-year student success: In search of best practice*. Keynote address presented at the 7th Pacific Rim First Year in Higher Education Conference, ‘Enhancing Transition to Higher Education: Strategies and Policies that Work’, Brisbane, Australia. Available from http://www.fyhe.com.au/past_papers/keynote2.htm

Outside the scope of the review

- Australian Government Department of Education, Science and Training. (2004). *Higher education attrition rates 1994–2002: A brief overview*. Canberra, Australia: Author.
- Higher Education Academy. (2001). *Strategies for widening participation in higher education: A guide to good practice* (Guide 01/36). York, UK: Author. Available from http://www.hefce.ac.uk/pubs/hefce/2001/01_36.htm
- James, R., Baldwin, G., Coates, H., Krause, K-L., & McInnis, C. (2004). *Analysis of equity groups in higher education 1991–2002*. Melbourne, Australia: Centre for the Study of Higher Education, The University of Melbourne.
- James, R., Baldwin, G., & McInnis, C. (1999). *Which university? The factors influencing the choices of prospective undergraduates* (99/3). Canberra: Australian Government Publishing Service. Retrieved from <http://www.dest.gov.au/archive/highered/eippubs/99-3/execsum.htm>
- McInnis, C., James, R., & McNaught, C. (1995). *First year on campus: Diversity in the initial experiences of Australian undergraduates* [Report prepared for the Committee for the Advancement of University Teaching]. Canberra, Australia: Australian Government Publishing Service.
- Pargetter, R., McInnes, C., James, R., Evans, M., Peel, M., & Dobson, I. (1999). *Transition from secondary to tertiary: A performance study*. Retrieved from <http://www.dest.gov.au/archive/highered/hes/hes36.htm>

Discussion of the literature

The majority of items in this period focused on the first generation approach to FYE and the Transition FYCP—co-curricular activities designed to assist students' transition from their previous educational experiences. The following discussion of the literature reflects these factors. However, other items bordering on the second generation approach are included where relevant.

The most popular co-curricular areas of interest were the activities of orientation and peer mentoring.

Orientation

The approaches to orientation focused consciously on the needs and concerns of the students as opposed to historical practice and precedent (Howells, 2003; Lintern, Johnston, & O'Reagan, 2001; K. Walker, 2001)—'student-centred rather than university-centred' (Lintern et al., p. 7). The Lintern et al. and K. Walker studies, coincidentally from (different) universities in Adelaide, Australia, were responding to 'the increasing diversity of students and the changing economic climate ... [which in turn] influenced student and institutional expectations of orientation programs' (Lintern et al., p. 17). Howells, providing a specific example of 'needs' versus 'historical precedent', argued that the starting point for orientation should be the students' 'self-conception as learner', an aspect that 'has been traditionally ignored' (p. 1). There was also interest in residential or camp programs as part of orientation (Crosthwaite & Churchward, 2000; Scott, McKain, & Jarman, 2000).

Peer programs

There were many studies of peer programs in this period (Calder, 2000; Clulow, 2000; Drew, Pike, Pooley, Young, & Breen, 2000, cited in Darlston-Jones et al., 2001; Jane, 2002; Macdonald, 2000; Muckert, 2002; R. Muldoon, 2003; Pearson, Roberts, O'Shea, & Lupton, 2002; Peat, Dalziel, & Grant, 2000, 2001; Powell & Peel, 2000; Stone, 2000) with Peat et al. (2001) reflecting the general finding that 'peer networks ... were helpful in easing the transition of undergraduate students' (p. 199). Asmar and Peseta (2001) made a strong case that the positive impact of peer interactions 'is true for graduate as well as undergraduate students' (p. 6), particularly in helping postgraduate students 'connect to a culture of research' (p. 1).

Reflecting the outcomes of the Krause and Duchesne (2000) study, Kantanis (2000a) highlighted the importance of 'social transition underpinning a successful academic transition to university' (p. 103), stressing the significant influence of the social dimension on engagement behaviour (McInnis, 2001). From an entirely different perspective, Carmichael (2003) used the evaluation of a peer mentoring program to promote the virtues of qualitative analysis.

Other programs and strategies

Other studies in this period either reported on or collated a variety of student support schemes and strategies and their uptake. These clustered into reports of:

- general collections of support strategies (Calder, 2000; Male & Lawrence, 2002; Mason-Rogers, 2002; Powell & Peel, 2000; Purnell, 2003; Ward, Crosling, & Marangos, cited in Crosling, 2003)
- programs with a specific *academic* focus such as assignment writing (Bonanno, 2002; Clerehan, 2002; Clerehan & Walker, 2003; Krause, 2001), language development (Elder, Erlam, & von Randow, 2002), assessment (Levin, 2001; Levin & Tempone, 2002) and career decision-making (Walck & Hensby, 2003)
- programs with a specific *social* focus such as developing a strong sense of community (Darlaston-Jones et al., 2003) or supporting students on remote, regional or satellite campuses (Bambrick, 2002), while
- Cameron and Tesoriero (2003) reported on student uptake of available programs.

Some authors reported on the development and implementation of programs that focused explicitly on the initial transition such as the Transition Program (Kantanis, 2000b), the (Science) Transition Program (Baker, Barrington, Gleeson, Livett, & McFadyen, 2002), the Transition Workshop (Peat et al., 2000, 2001), the Transition Support Program (Skene, 2003), the Diploma in Foundation Studies (Levy & Murray, 2002, 2003) and the Advanced Certificate in University Studies (Bull, 2000). In the main, these programs were, at best, faculty based.

In what Harvey et al. (2006) regarded as ‘a rare example of a more strategic model focussing on a whole university approach’ (p. 58), Pitkethly and Prosser (2001) reported on an attempt at developing and implementing a more extensive university-wide First Year Experience Project that aimed ‘to promote change and innovation in first year teaching programs and administrative processes to address transition issues’ (p. 188). There was also a program that included the beginnings of a process of identifying and supporting academically at-risk students (Powell & Peel, 2000), while McGowan (2003) proposed a mainstream teaching and learning focus on ‘discipline-specific language development ... to reduce the incidence of unintentional plagiarism by confused first year students’ (para. 1).

Finally, and reflecting a transition pedagogy focus that emerges strongly later in the decade,¹¹ Perry and Allard (2003) embedded a *Transitions and Connections* module (p. 80) into the curriculum of two core subjects designed to allow students to ‘make connections [with] some of the issues that they face when making the transition to university’ (p. 75).

As highlighted in the data summarised in Table 4, reports of specific co-curricular activities, along with the collection of, at best, faculty-based transition programs and strategies, reflected the focus of the literature on subjects, programs and faculties (rather than the university as a whole) and on first year groups in general (rather than specific equity groups).

Students’ individual characteristics

There was also some interest at this time in identifying the influence of students’ personal and learning characteristics on transition to university. A few examples: Bolitho (2001) explored the interaction between personality, learning styles and initial degree choice on anxiety and career commitment, finding a complex of interactions, while Horstmanhof and Zimitat (2003a, 2003b) investigated the usefulness of Social Exchange Theory for understanding student retention. Zimitat (2003) explored the impact of employment and family commitments on the FYE. Tchen, Carter, Gibbons and McLaughlin (2001) found that high levels of stress, anxiety and use of non-functional coping mechanisms were strong indicators of poor academic performance.

Obversely, McKenzie and Schweitzer (2001), investigating the factors influencing academic success, found that while integration into university, self-efficacy and employment responsibilities were predictive of university grades, previous pre-tertiary academic performance was the most significant predictor of university performance—an outcome confirmed specifically by Dancer and Fiebig (2000) with mathematics predicting success in econometrics. De Clercq, Pearson and Rolfe (2001), focusing on previous tertiary education, found that particular sub-cohorts (for example, arts and nursing students) ‘encountered more academic difficulties than others [for example, science students] in the first year of a medicine course’ (p. 417).

¹¹ See Chapter 4.

In a study focusing on cognitive complexity and problem-solving, MacPherson (2002) found that the great majority of first year students were able to judge the validity of conclusions provided that the new information was straightforward. However, once the new information became more complex, students had difficulty isolating the information relevant to the question they were trying to answer. She speculated that this could explain why many undergraduates (particularly in first year), complain that they cannot find useful information for assignments.

A combination of self-, peer and tutor ('mixed mode') assessment was found to enhance deep learning and to reduce performance anxiety (D. Morgan, 2003). Doring, Bingham and Bramwell-Vial (2001), investigating beliefs underpinning success at university, found that students, at the beginning of the university year, believed that 'motivation, attitude and efficiency were more likely to contribute to one's success at university than intelligence and social support' (p. 15). However, a longitudinal study by C. Johnston (2001) 'indicated [not only] a slide into surface learning during their first year [a result consistent with that of Elliot (2000)] ... [but also] that their expectations of learning at the university level were not realised' (p. 169). Many of these studies had a psychometric focus, using standardised data collection instruments. For example, the studies by Bolitho, by Elliot and by D. Morgan used Biggs' (1987) Study Process Questionnaire while the Bolitho study and the Tchen et al. (2001) study used Spielberger's State-Trait Anxiety Inventory (Spielberger et al., 1983).

Expectations, particularly in the area of assessment, was also a topic that engendered some interest, from both student and staff perspectives. For example, reflecting the dissonance in C. Johnston's (2001) study, Barker (2000), dealing with first year science, reported that the students had expectations that university lecturers would provide explicit instruction, guidance and feedback on written tasks, while the university lecturers expected students to be taking more responsibility for their own learning. Vardi (2000) highlighted the challenges faced by students when first year lecturers had differing requirements and expectations of writing in a multidisciplinary compulsory first year. Speaking more generally, James, McInnis and Devlin (2002), on passing a 'critical spotlight on student assessment in Australian higher education, [concluded that] there had been a strong and welcome trend in universities to provide clearer statements

of criteria and standards for the benefit of students' (p. 1). However, the 'new realities of ... busy and complex ... student lives [for example, working longer part-time hours] ... has prompted a search for imaginative assessment practices which do not ... compromise the integrity and rigour of academic requirements' (p. 3).

Generational approaches

Although the major emphasis was on first generation activities, there was considerable evidence of second generation approaches to catering for the FYE. Some examples: Peat and Franklin (2002) reported on the impact of moving curriculum resources online, while Snepvangers and Yorke (2002) examined the effect of revising a subject to foster engagement by aligning the assessment with a real-world professional context. A few literature items were classified as reflecting a third generation approach. These items reported work in progress on developing an institution-wide holistic and coordinated approach to supporting first year students—some operational to varying degrees (Emmitt, Callaghan, Warren, & Postill, 2002; Kantanis, 2000b), others at a conceptual level only (McInnis, 2001; McLoughlin, 2002; Pitkethly & Prosser, 2001).

Some issues related to research design and future perspective

Considering the literature as a whole, a significant number of studies were exploratory in nature, particularly in 2000, reflecting the relatively new interest in the FYE in Australasia. Many reported pilot studies (for example, Jorgensen, Gordon, & Slater, 2001; Kantanis, 2000b), 'initial insights' (Meyer & Shanahan, 2001, p. 127) or in-progress initiatives (for example, Crosthwaite & Churchward, 2000), and an intention to carry out further studies (for example, C. Smith et al., 2000) or to introduce further initiatives (for example, Grob, 2000), while there was considerable emphasis on identifying 'factors influencing ...' (for example, Dancer & Fiebig, 2000; Doring et al., 2001; Macdonald, 2000).

Surveys seeking information about first year students' experiences (for example, C. Ballantyne, 2000; Pearson et al., 2002) and general discussions about transition, retention and engagement (for example, Blunden, 2002; Elliott, 2002; Macdonald, 2000) were not uncommon and there were the beginnings of a focus on specific cohorts such as Australian Indigenous (Farrington, Page, & DiGregorio, 2001), Māori (Morrison, 2000), mature-aged

(Kantanis, 2002; P. Richardson & Gough, 2001) and secondary school cohorts who were underrepresented at university (Jorgensen et al., 2001). This neophytic nature could also be described as an *ecological* emphasis—a mapping out or describing of the research context—which is typical of the early stages of research in a new field. Before more sophisticated research can be carried out (for example, *what if*), it is necessary to find out *what is* (see Bronfenbrenner, 1976).

Related to this, and perhaps reflecting the real or imagined optimism engendered by the general euphoria and future orientation associated with the new millennium, was an optimistic focus on the potential for enhancement. Programs were seen as evolving (Baker et al., 2002) and worthy of developing a model (Darlaston-Jones et al., 2001) or idealised version (Lintern et al., 2001). This forward-looking perspective is summarised by Lintern et al.'s expansive sentiments that 'continuing development and evolution of ... programs needs to be based on input from the various stakeholders, institutional support, integration of the sub-programs and mindfulness of the larger socio-political educational context' (p. 17). By way of balance, Kift (2002) raised the sobering issue of the increased casualisation of academic staff, offering examples of 'models of best practice that have been developed ... to train, support and nurture this staff cohort' (para. 1). Lintern et al.'s focus on the complexity of the university context was also reflected in Lawrence's (2001, 2002, 2003) alternative interpretation of the deficit approach to explaining commencing students' lack of academic literacies. Her proposal, again positive and optimistic, was to consider transition as 'one of gaining familiarity with, engaging and mastering the new culture's multiple discourses ... [with the support of staff who] share a responsibility in this process' (para. 1). Again, by way of balance, Eijkman (2002) called for a 'critical reframing' (p. 1) of academic discourses to accommodate and value life experiences. Another indicator of optimism and future orientation was the handful of third generation approaches referred to above, a number of which conceptualised institution-wide holistic initiatives for future operationalisation (for example, Emmitt et al., 2002; Kantanis, 2000b; Pitkethly & Prosser, 2001).

Another emphasis noted was the focus on specific learning environments or disciplines: science (Baker et al., 2002; Peat et al., 2001; Zeegers & Martin, 2001); computing/engineering (Crosthwaite & Churchward, 2000; Male & Lawrence, 2002; Scott et al., 2000); commerce/economics (Clulow, 2000; C. Johnston, 2001; Levin, 2001); psychology (Darlaston-Jones et al., 2001; Muckert, 2002); and law (Kift, 2003; L. McNamara, 2000).¹² This emphasis not only reflected the dominance of the focus on program, faculty and, to a lesser extent, subject as the locus of the studies but also was a strong indicator of the siloed and isolated nature of FYE activities. The Baker et al. study in science was of particular note in that there was some evidence of academic and administration staff working together.

Summary of the 2000–2003 period

The major focus of this period was on isolated or siloed first generation co-curricular activities, particularly orientation and peer mentoring, along with programs and strategies, all designed to assist students to make the transition from previous to university educational experiences. In addition, psychometrically-based investigations of the influence of individual personal and learning characteristics on transition behaviours were common along with, to a lesser extent, explorations of the expectations–reality nexus. Also, there was some evidence of second generation approaches. Considering the literature as a whole, it was essentially exploratory, optimistic and future-oriented but generally reflecting a series of isolated events that were subject, program or faculty based.

¹² This list is indicative rather than exhaustive.

Downloaded Copy



Chapter 3

Discussion of the literature: 2004–2007

Reflecting the optimism referred to in Chapter 2, there were significant future-focused initiatives spanning the 2003–2004 period. In Australia, B. Nelson (2003) proposed a ‘comprehensive ten year plan that ... [aimed to] create a more diverse, equitable and high quality tertiary education sector’ (para. 1); and in New Zealand, in attempting to operationalise the ‘principle of open access ... [where] a domestic student who has met the minimum entry requirements for enrolling in a particular course ... is entitled to enter that course, ... [the TES-1 focused on] increasing the participation of Māori and Pasifika students, students with a disability and for students from lower socioeconomic backgrounds’ (New Zealand Ministry of Education, 2006, para. 28). This chapter, focusing on the 2004–2007 period, continues the story of the FYE experience in Australasia.

As identified in Tables 1 to 5 for the year cluster 2004–2007:

- One hundred and fifteen items of literature were reviewed with again the majority being conference presentations (54/115, 47.0%). Just over one-third were publications (39/115, 33.9%) and close to one-fifth were reports/reviews (22/115, 19.1%).
- Of the 215 inferred instances of FYCPs, the Transition principle was again dominant with close to one-third of the references (66/215, 30.7%). However, both the Design (46/215, 21.4%) and Engagement (36/215, 16.7%) principles and, to a lesser extent, the Assessment principle (29/215, 13.5%) emerged during this period as being significant.
- There were 149 inferred instances of approaches catering for the FYE with second generation the major approach (78/149, 52.3%), taking over as the dominant one from

the first generation approach. First generation approaches, however, were still significant (66/149, 44.3%).

- Subject-based studies dominated (23/73, 31.5%) as did a focus on first year students as a general group (56/74, 75.7%) rather than specific non-traditional or equity cohorts (18/74, 24.3%).

Literature of influence and/or interest

Within the scope of the review

Cullen, M. (2006, April). *Ensuring quality and relevance—future directions for funding tertiary organisations. Speech to stakeholders [Speech notes]*. Retrieved from <http://www.tec.govt.nz/Documents/Reports%20and%20other%20documents/tertiary-reforms-education-changes-and-consultation-4%20April%202006.pdf>

Kift, S. (2004, July). *Organising first year engagement around learning: Formal and informal curriculum intervention*. Keynote address presented at the 8th Pacific Rim First Year in Higher Education Conference, ‘Dealing with Diversity’, Melbourne, Australia. Retrieved from http://www.fyhe.com.au/past_papers/papers04.htm

Kift, S., & Nelson, K. (2005, July). *Beyond curriculum reform: Embedding the transition experience*. Paper presented at the 28th HERDSA Annual Conference, ‘Higher Education in a Changing World’, Sydney, Australia. Retrieved from <http://www.herdsa.org.au/wp-content/uploads/conference/2005/papers/kift.pdf>

- Krause, K-L., Hartley, R., James, R., & McInnis, C. (2005). *The first year experience in Australian universities: Findings from a decade of national studies*. Melbourne, Australia: Centre for the Study of Higher Education, The University of Melbourne.
- Lizzio, A., & Wilson, K. (2004). First-year students' perceptions of capability. *Studies in Higher Education*, 29(1), 109–128. doi: 10.1080/1234567032000164903
- New Zealand Ministry of Education. (2006). *OECD thematic review of tertiary education: New Zealand country background report*. Retrieved from the OECD website: <http://www.oecd.org/dataoecd/20/46/36441052.pdf>
- Yorke, M. (2006, July). *Student engagement: Deep, surface or strategic?* Keynote address presented at the 9th Pacific Rim First Year in Higher Education Conference, 'Engaging Students', Gold Coast, Australia. Retrieved from http://www.fyhe.com.au/past_papers/2006/Keynotes/Yorke.pdf
- Zepke, N., Leach, L., Prebble, T., Campbell, A., Coltman, D., Dewart, B., ... Wilson, S. (2005). *Improving tertiary student outcomes in the first year of study* [Report]. Wellington, New Zealand: Teaching and Learning Research Initiative. Available from <http://www.tlri.org.nz/improving-tertiary-student-outcomes-their-first-year-study>

Outside the scope of the review

- Harvey, L., Drew, S., & Smith, M. (2006). *The first year experience: A literature review for the Higher Education Academy*. Sheffield, United Kingdom: Higher Education Academy. Retrieved from http://www.heacademy.ac.uk/projects/detail/litreview/lr_2006_harvey
- James, R., Bexley, E., Devlin, M., & Marginson, S. (2007). *Australian university student finances 2006. Final report of a national survey of students in public universities* [Report prepared for Universities Australia]. Melbourne, Australia: Centre for the Study of Higher Education, The University of Melbourne. Retrieved from <http://www.universitiesaustralia.edu.au/resources/272/135>
- John N. Gardner Institute for Excellence in Undergraduate Education. (2005). *Foundational Dimensions® (Four-Year College Version)*. Retrieved from <http://www.fyfoundations.org/4year.aspx>

Discussion of the literature

As with the 2000–2003 cluster, first generation approaches focusing on co-curricular activities and the Transition FYCP tended to be still strongly represented in the 2004–2007 literature but with some subtle differences (for example, varying the mode of delivery and expanding the client base for programs and activities) and significant changes (for example, the emergence of new FYCPs and aspects of the second generation approach).

Qualitative changes in existing emphases

The co-curricular activities of orientation and peer programs were again dominant. However, there was evidence of increased sophistication in their implementation. With orientation, for example, Jarkey (2004) 'viewed orientation not as a "one-off" information session, but as an ongoing learning experience' (p. 186) and proposed a holistic semester-long approach to orientation. Similarly, Morda, Sonn, Ali and Ohtsuka (2007) extended the traditional pre-semester orientation four weeks into the semester, integrating activities into the curriculum, while Duff, Quinn, Johnston and Lock (2007) reported on an experiment to devolve orientation activities from an institutional level to a school level.

With regard to peer programs, and reflecting Fowler's (2004) assessment that 'the popularity of student-mentoring programs in institutions of higher education seems to be on the rise' (p. 18), peer mentoring was reported in its various forms—PASS (peer-assisted study sessions), SI (supplemental instruction) and PALS (peer-assisted learning strategy)—(J. Boyd & Linton, 2006; Calder, 2004; Dawson, Lockyer, & Ferry, 2007; Fowler, 2004; Glaser, Hall, & Halperin, 2006; Huijser & Kimmins, 2005; Lewis, O'Brien, Rogan, & Shorten, 2005; V. Miller, Oldfield, & Bulmer, 2004; Pelliccione & Albon, 2004; Penman & White, 2006; Rhoden & Boin, 2004; Sturgess & Kennedy, 2004). A number of these programs were designed for specific cohorts—distance education (Sturgess & Kennedy), international (Rhoden & Boin), SI leaders (Dawson et al.)—or modes such as online (Dawson et al.; Huijser & Kimmins). Williams and Sher (2007) reported on an extension of the peer mentoring approach to a guidance mentor role where an experienced student support person contacted at-risk students to provide appropriate advice.

There were several strands of investigations that mirrored those in the 2000–2003 period. For example, Andrews (2006), picking up on Barker's (2000) misalignment of student and lecturer expectations around learning outcomes and processes, and the desire for students to take responsibility for their own learning, proposed that there should be a focus 'early in the semester on rigorous alignment of expectations' (p. 1) and developed an interactive CD to facilitate this. With similar intent, Meyer and Shanahan (2004), building on their earlier modelling of the impact of misconceptions of economics on first year learning outcomes (Meyer & Shanahan, 2001), advocated the development of metacognitive capacity in students to counter misconceptions and improve achievement.

Reflecting the 2000–2003 interpretation of the Transition principle, there were a number of studies that simply had the needs and challenges of specific cohorts of students as their focus: non-traditional cohorts (Benseman, Coxon, Anderson, & Anae, 2006), those with disabilities (Brett & Kavanagh, 2007), who were mature-aged (J. Ballantyne, Todd, & Olm, 2007; Todd & Ballantyne, 2007), were distance education students (Mir & Rahaman, 2007), had a non-English speaking background (Bagot et al., 2004) or were located on campuses with specific and sometimes unique characteristics (Pillay, Clarke, & Taylor, 2006; P. Taylor, Pillay, & Clarke, 2004; Zimitat & Sebastian, 2007). Zepke and Leach (2007) explored how university lecturers catered for such student diversity but, generally speaking, the focus was on commencing students as a whole as indicated in Table 4 and implied in the following literature.

New emphases

An increase in second generation approaches and FYCPs

Evidence of the curriculum-focused activities of second generation approaches began to increase along with the emergence of the Design, Engagement and Assessment FYCPs. The Design principle proposes that curriculum design should be student-focused, explicit and relevant. The Engagement principle emphasises active, peer-to-peer and teacher-student interaction and collaborative learning utilising learning communities, while the Assessment principle highlights the importance of regular formative evaluation and feedback. These principles were reflected in the reporting of numerous student-centred approaches to teaching and learning including:

- building on existing knowledge and experience (J. Ellis & Salisbury, 2004)
- acknowledging the influence of the nature of discipline knowledge (Read, George, Masters, & King, 2005) and its transfer (Britton, New, Sharma, & Yardley, 2005)
- examples of innovative team teaching (Mandel, Harper, Moore, & Addinsall, 2005)
- attempts to develop quality feedback, sometimes successful (P. Ross & Tronson, 2005), sometimes not (O'Byrne & Thompson, 2005)
- the development of learning communities (Forret et al., 2007)
- voluntary workshops based on informal cooperative groupings (Sharma, Mendes, & O'Byrne, 2005)
- online activities
 - group projects (Allen, Crosky, McAlpine, Hoffman, & Munroe, 2006; McAlpine, Reidsema, & Allen, 2006)
 - multi-media resources (Hatsidimitris & Wolfe, 2007)
 - support (Coffee, 2007; Oliver, 2006; Shannon, 2006)
 - assessment (O'Byrne & Thompson, 2005; Schulte, 2006)
- a blending of 'traditional activities—lectures, tutorials ... with ... collaborative learning ... peer review [etc.] that more closely mirror professional practice' (Groen & Carmody, 2005, p. 30).

There were also a number of reportedly successful programs that focused on 'academic and critical literacy skills to enhance the learning experiences of NESB students' (Maldoni, Kennelly, & Davies, 2007, p. 11) or 'English as an additional language (EAL) students' (Shackelford & Blickem, 2007, p. 72). Using a 'community of practice' approach to staff development that addressed first year learning and teaching issues, S. Wilson (2007) claimed improvements in a variety of student engagement behaviours such as 'academic challenge, active and collaborative learning and student-faculty interaction' (p. 1).

An explicit focus on assessment spotlighted the 'bright ideas and evolving evidence' (McLeod, 2005, p. iii) of contemporary issues at that time such as:

- criterion-referenced (K. Burton & Cuffe, 2005), formative (Peat, Franklin, Devlin, & Charles, 2005) and self- (G. Thompson, Pilgrim, & Oliver, 2005; Winning, Lekkass, & Townsend, 2007) assessment

- scaffolded assessment tasks for large diverse first year cohorts that either required both individual and collaborative work (Kazlauskas, Gimel, Thornton, Thomas, & Davis, 2007; Morris, Porter, & Griffiths, 2004) or were developmental with support mechanisms embedded within the curriculum such as deconstructing the assignment question and spreading it across the semester (Star & McDonald, 2007)
- constructive alignment between teaching strategies, assessment and student learning outcomes (McCreery, 2005; N. Muldoon & Lee, 2005), especially to ensure the early acquisition of enabling academic literacies (Kift, 2004).

These approaches addressed the challenge put forward by James et al. (2002) earlier of searching for 'imaginative assessment practices' (p. 3). However, more perennial and traditional issues such as feedback (for example, Blanksby & Chan, 2006; Murphy et al., 2006) were also canvassed, while the graduate attribute focus on group work prompted a discussion of the dilemmas facing lecturers using group assessment in a multicultural classroom (Strauss & U, 2007). Covering both contemporary and traditional approaches, Krause et al. (2007) reported 'best practice in assessment in biological sciences' (p. 12) from eight Australian universities, with 'many examples ... [from] first year' (p. 2).

The increased emphasis on student self-directed learning and the associated increase in responsibility for their own behaviour manifested as:

- an examination of reflective learning (Paton, 2006; A. Yeo & Zadnik, 2004)
- an investigation of the promotion of deep learning approaches by teaching and learning activities (Groen & Carmody, 2005) including assessment (Bellette, 2005; Bird, 2006), with Bellette's finding paralleling D. Morgan's (2003) results
- a renewed interest in plagiarism (Darab, 2006; Emerson, MacKay, & Rees, 2006; S. Yeo, 2006, 2007) initially raised by McGowan in 2003.

In-depth case studies detailed by Skyrme (2007) established that the traditional do-it-yourself learning expected in a university can have a negative impact on engagement. Further, a comparison of the conventional 'transmission approach' with a learner-centred 'studio learning environment' approach by A. Yeo and Zadnik (2004), although favouring the latter,

produced somewhat complex results such as the interpersonal qualities of teachers being of higher concern to the less successful students, regardless of instructional mode.

The majority of the studies reported in this section thus far have been subject based and, to a lesser extent, program or faculty based.

An emergence of third generation approaches

Ali and Lockstone (2006) investigated factors that could place students 'at risk' (p. 1) and then endeavoured to identify strategies to minimise the impact of those risk factors. An important conclusion they reached was that 'one of the main problems was that the student support infrastructure in universities was often separate from rather than being integrated into faculties and the lecture and tutorial system' (p. 5). This highlights the importance of having academic and professional staff working together. Using the nomenclature of academic, professional (student services) and administration to designate staff groups, there were two distinct subsets of literature here, one that focused on cooperation *between* staff groups (for example, Skene, Hogan, & Brown, 2006; Stone, 2005) and one that focused on cooperation *within* one group (for example, professional: Jardine, 2005; academic: Waters, 2004). These are discussed briefly.

Skene et al. (2006) in their First Year Initiatives Project collated ideas used across their institution to facilitate transition. The aim was to promote dialogue on the FYE across campus by setting up a 'useful and interesting' (p. 6) web-based resource of the collated ideas and creating a network of people interested in transition and the FYE. Similarly, Stone (2005) proposed an approach that, through the formation of a representative First-Year Retention Committee, 'aimed to integrate academic, administrative and support strategies ... to improve the student's entire first year experience' (p. 33). Waters (2004) also reported on a transition program, UniStart, that 'brought together a range of stakeholders with the aims of better coordinating efforts to improve the first-year student experience and establishing an ongoing University-wide consultative mechanism for monitoring and evaluating these activities' (p. 1).

In another example, Purnell (2004) reported on a university-wide induction strategy designed to provide a multifaceted approach to the challenge of the FYE and the role of both academic and professional staff in this endeavour. A first year

experience task force was established and initiated activities such as mentoring programs, early assessments, ‘second thoughts’ weeks, Māori study spaces, language provision for international students and space for staff to share good practice. Moving from aspiration to action but at a micro level, Kirkness, Neill and Naidoo (2007) reported a small case study of the impact of the collaboration of a discipline teacher and an academic advisor on the development of reading skills in social work students.

At a macro level and based on the premise that ‘transition is a responsibility that must be shared and understood by *all* areas of the university—academic and professional, student services, administrators and environmental’ (K. Nelson, Kift, Humphreys, & Harper, 2006, p. 3), K. Nelson and colleagues explored ‘how good practice for managing the transition of students into university is institutionalised in a large university’ (K. Nelson, Kift, & Creagh, 2007, p. 1) and proposed a Blueprint of elements to be mediated through curriculum-based activities designed to engage students in learning, provide timely access to support and create a sense of belonging. Kift and Nelson (2005) synthesised this process by introducing the term *transition pedagogy* into the literature and discussed its embedding in the curriculum: ‘We will pilot, develop and communicate a university-wide sustainable, integrated, coordinated, curriculum-mediated transition framework’ (p. 232). The introduction of the notion of *transition pedagogy* at this time provided the conceptual framework for moving beyond the first and second generation approaches to dealing with commencing students’ FYE and has proven to be influential in FYE research and practice in the years that followed.

In all of these cross-institutional cases, the programs were in pilot or planned form, for example, in Waters (2004), ‘the findings from the pilot ... intended to inform and guide the activities of the various working groups’ (p. 2) and ‘the development of strategies for improving communication with students; formalising and supporting the position of first-year coordinators; better supporting casual teachers; and targeting and assisting students who are potentially at risk’ (p. 7). In Stone (2005, p. 33):

... discussion would focus on ways in which strategies such as peer mentoring, orientation programs, learning development programs and so on, could be developed and integrated within the academic framework of the student’s program, involving the commitment of both academic and support staff in the planning and delivery of such strategies.

Purnell (2004) specified the intention to expand their program to include peer tutoring, staff development workshops and a virtual first year physics laboratory. K. Nelson et al. (2006) indicated that on ‘completing the pilot phase ... and finalising the Blueprint [for enhanced transition], the focus would turn then to raising staff awareness and designing staff development programs’ (p. 9).

By way of offering infrastructure support to facilitate such cross-institutional approaches to transition programs, K. Nelson, Kift and Harper (2005, p. 509) proposed a:

... virtual learning environment (VLE) ... [that would] provide a much needed opportunity for bridging the gap between academic, administrative and support programs. A VLE for students-in-transition would allow the many and varied interactions between the new student and their institution to be online, tailored and integrated.

All of these programs described above had elements that were operational. On the other hand, Wylie (2005) developed a comprehensive retention model of logically connected intervention alerts designed to improve student persistence. He recommended that the model could act as ‘a theoretical guide that would inevitably require modification and development for local application’ (p. 14).

As opposed to these generic programs, there was still evidence of siloed programs (for example, in computer science/software engineering: Moffat, Hughes, Sondergaard, & Gruba, 2005; law: Kift, 2004; nursing: Penman & White, 2006; social work: Cameron & Tesoriero, 2004; and science: R. Ellis, Taylor, & Drury, 2007). Like Kift (2002) earlier, Cameron and Tesoriero stressed the need for more support of casual staff. There was also a continuing though somewhat reduced interest in the factors intrinsic to the individual—personality traits, constructs, conceptions, learning styles and strategies and vocational experience—that are associated with successful performance, interpreted as academic success or persistence, in the first year at university (J. Ballantyne et al., 2007; Bagot et al., 2004; Birch & Miller, 2006; R. Ellis et al., 2007; Hillman & McMillan, 2005; Holden, 2005; Lizzio & Wilson, 2004; Madigan, 2006; McKenzie, Gow, & Schweitzer, 2004; Yeung, Read, & Schmid, 2005). Of significance in this collection is the study by Lizzio and Wilson that explored students’ perceptions of their capability to learn. Building on this, Lizzio (2006) developed the *five senses of success* model that formed the basis for the design of an orientation and transition strategy for commencing students.

There were also reviews and studies that explored institutional factors (including teaching quality) and factors external to the university (Anderson & McCrea, 2005; Holden, 2005; Jardine, 2005; Lawrence, 2005; Zepke, Leach, & Prebble, 2006; Zimitat, 2006). P. Taylor, Millwater and Nash (2007), building on the work of Bridges (2003), conceptualised student transitions as a series of coexisting and overlapping identities with the first transition from pre-enrolment to student as crucial.

Summary of the 2004–2007 period

The 2004–2007 period was highlighted by both quantitative and qualitative changes in the FYE literature but remained primarily subject, program or faculty based. While the first generation co-curricular activities were still prevalent, they were subtly more sophisticated. However, they were overshadowed by a dominant second generation literature that reflected a student-centred philosophy underpinned by the emergent FYCPs of Design, Engagement and Assessment, and evidence of the beginnings of cross-institutional cooperation involving academic and professional staff. Although there was a distinct and, we would submit, a positive difference between the literature of the early years of the decade and this middle period, there was a tentativeness as reflected in the pilot nature of many of the programs. Of significance, however, was the introduction and defining of the term *transition pedagogy*, which provided the opportunity to move beyond the first and second generation approaches to understanding the FYE.



Chapter 4

Discussion of the literature: 2008–2010

While the patterns of the source of items, the instances of FYCPs and generational approaches in the 2004–2007 and the 2008–2010 periods were somewhat similar, there were more items and instances over the shorter time range (3 versus 4 years) in the latter period, reflecting the quite dramatic increase in FYE-related outputs since the beginning of 2008. This chapter concludes the investigation of Australasian FYE activities by examining the extensive literature from 2008, 2009 and 2010.

As identified in Tables 1 to 5 for the year cluster 2008–2010:

- One hundred and ninety-one items of literature were reviewed with again the majority being conference presentations (103/191, 53.9%). Just under one-third were publications (59/191, 30.9%) and there was a significant minority of reports/reviews (29/191, 15.2%).
- Compared to the 2003–2007 period, there was a higher proportion of the Engagement principle, the second generation approach was more dominant, and there was a surge in the third generation approaches, particularly in 2009.
- There were 329 instances of FYCPs with the Transition principle accounting for just under one-third (99/329, 30.1%), the Engagement principle just over one-quarter (89/329, 27.1%) and the Design principle just over one-fifth (71/329, 21.6%).
- There were 215 cases of approaches to catering for the FYE with the majority being second generation (129/215, 60.0%). Of note was the strong emergence of the third generation approach (16/215, 7.4%), particularly in 2009.

- University-wide activities started to emerge (41/136, 30.1%) as did an explicit focus on non-traditional or equity cohorts (39/103, 37.9%). However, subject-based activities were still significant (37/136, 27.2%).

Literature of influence and/or interest

Within the scope of the review

Airini, Brown, D., Curtis, E., Johnson, O., Luatua, F., O'Shea, M., ... Ulugia-Pua, M. (2010). *Success for all: Improving Māori and Pasifika student success in degree-level studies*. Wellington, New Zealand: Teaching and Learning Research Initiative. Retrieved from http://www.tlri.org.nz/assets/A_Project-PDFs/9247-Airini/9247-Airini-final-report.pdf

Australasian Survey of Student Engagement. (2008). *Attracting, engaging and retaining: New conversations about learning: Australasian student engagement report*. Melbourne, Australia: Australian Council for Educational Research.¹³

Australasian Survey of Student Engagement. (2009). *Engaging students for success: Australasian student engagement report*. Melbourne, Australia: Australian Council for Educational Research.

Australasian Survey of Student Engagement. (2010). *Doing more for learning: Enhancing engagement and outcomes: Australasian student engagement report*. Melbourne, Australia: Australian Council for Educational Research.

¹³ These reports present data collected in the year prior to publication beginning in 2007 and form part of an ongoing series of annual reports, all of which are available at <http://www.acer.edu.au/research/ausse/reports>.

- Australian Government Department of Education, Employment and Workplace Relations (DEEWR). (2009). *Transforming Australia's higher education system*. Canberra, Australia: Author. Retrieved from http://www.deewr.gov.au/HigherEducation/Documents/PDF/Additional%20Report%20-%20Transforming%20Aus%20Higher%20ED_webaw.pdf
- Australian Learning and Teaching Council (ALTC). (2008). *What's happening in assessment?* Sydney, Australia: Author. Available from <http://www.altc.edu.au/resources?text=What%E2%80%99s+happening+in+assessment%3F>
- Australian Learning and Teaching Council (ALTC). (2010). *What's happening in assessment? 2009*. Sydney, Australia: Author. Available from <http://www.altc.edu.au/resources?text=What%E2%80%99s+happening+in+assessment%3F>
- Bradley, D., Noonan, P., Nugent, H., & Scales, B. (2008). *Review of Australian higher education* [Final report]. Canberra, Australia: Commonwealth of Australia. Available from <http://www.deewr.gov.au/highereducation/review/pages/reviewofaustralianhighereducationreport.aspx>
- Devlin, M. (2010, June). *Non-traditional university student achievement: Theory, policy and practice in Australia*. Keynote address presented at the 13th Pacific Rim First Year in Higher Education Conference, 'Aspiration, Access, Achievement', Adelaide, Australia. Retrieved from http://www.fyhe.com.au/past_papers/papers10/content/html/keynote.html
- James, R., Krause, K-L., & Jennings, C. (2010). *The first year experience in Australian universities: Findings from 1994 to 2009*. Melbourne, Australia: Centre for Studies in Higher Education, The University of Melbourne.
- Kift, S. (2009a). *Articulating a transition pedagogy to scaffold and to enhance the first year student learning experience in Australian higher education: Final report for ALTC Senior Fellowship Program*. Sydney, Australia: Australian Learning and Teaching Council. Available from <http://www.altc.edu.au/resource-transition-pedagogy-report-qut-2009>
- Kift, S., Nelson, K., & Clarke, J. (2010). Transition pedagogy: A third generation approach to FYE—A case study of policy and practice for the higher education sector. *International Journal of the First Year in Higher Education*, 1(1), 1–20. doi: 10.5204/intjfyhe.v1i1.13
- Leach, L., & Zepke, N. (2010). Making it into the pipeline: Transitions from school to tertiary education. *Journal of Adult Learning Aotearoa New Zealand*, 38(1), 5–22.
- Tinto, V. (2009, February). *Taking student retention seriously: Rethinking the first year of university*. Keynote address presented at the FYE Curriculum Design Symposium, 'Articulating a Transition Pedagogy', Brisbane, Australia. Retrieved from <http://www.fyecd2009.qut.edu.au/resources>
- Wilson, K. (2009, June–July). *The impact of institutional, programmatic and personal interventions on an effective and sustainable first-year student experience*. Keynote address presented at the 12th Pacific Rim First Year in Higher Education Conference, 'Preparing for Tomorrow Today: The first Year as Foundation', Townsville, Australia. Retrieved from http://www.fyhe.com.au/past_papers/papers09/ppts/Keithia_Wilson_paper.pdf
- Zepke, N., & Leach, L. (2010a). *Improving student engagement in post-compulsory education: A synthesis of research literature* [Report]. Wellington, New Zealand: Teaching and Learning Research Initiative. Retrieved from http://www.tlri.org.nz/assets/A_Project-PDFs/9261-Zepke/9261-Literature-review.pdf

Outside the scope of the review

- The Quality Assurance Agency for Higher Education Scotland. (2008). *Quality enhancement themes. First Year: Engagement and empowerment*. Glasgow, United Kingdom: Author. Retrieved from <http://www.enhancementthemes.ac.uk/themes/FirstYear/default.asp>
- Yorke, M., & Longden, B. (2008). *The first-year experience of higher education in the UK* [Final report of a project funded by the Higher Education Academy]. York, United Kingdom: Higher Education Academy. Retrieved from http://www.heacademy.ac.uk/news/detail/fye_final_report

Discussion of the literature

The emergence of the Engagement principle

Compared to the 2004–2007 period, this final year cluster evidenced both a quantitative increase (more items and instances over a fewer number of years) and qualitative changes in emphases. Continuing the trend noted in the 2004–2007 period, both first (co-curricular) and second generation (curricular) activities were evident but, while the latter had emerged as the dominant approach in 2004–2007, it became dramatically so in this period—to the extent that it was almost twice as evident (second: 129/215, 60.0% versus first: 70/215, 32.6%). Similarly, while the Transition and Design FYCPs remained prominent, particularly the former in 2009, the Engagement FYCP, where ‘the curriculum should enact an engaging and involving curriculum pedagogy and should enable active and collaborative learning’ (Kift, 2009a, p. 41), overtook Design as the second most prevalent principle.¹⁴

Over this period, the FYEPs were formally articulated under the auspices of Kift’s ALTC Senior Fellowship (2009a), which also delivered a range of research- and evidence-based resources (such as seven program-based case studies, 17 expert commentaries on the case studies,¹⁵ a FYE symposium DVD, eBook of FYE exemplars, website and checklists) to encourage intentional first year curriculum design and support for the learning engagement, success and retention of contemporary heterogeneous cohorts. Duncan and her colleagues (Duncan et al., 2009) further facilitated the application of the FYCPs to curriculum development, implementation and evaluation by operationalising the principles in some detail and producing other readily available resources (K. Nelson, Creagh, Kift, & Clarke, 2010). An example of all principles in action in an actual program is provided by Di Corpo (2009). However, the story of the 2008–2010 period is of the emergence of the Engagement principle and the centrality of the engagement concept.

¹⁴ The data in Table 2 also indicated that the Engagement principle showed the largest increase of any principle between any successive year clusters: from 36 incidences in 2004–2007 to 89 in 2008–2010, an increase of 53.

¹⁵ The Fellowship resources are available at <http://www.fyhe.qut.edu.au/transitionpedagogy>, while details of the case studies and the expert commentaries are available at <http://www.fyhe.qut.edu.au/transitionpedagogy/casestudies> and <http://www.fyhe.qut.edu.au/transitionpedagogy/expertcommen>.

The impact of various factors on student engagement

Information and communication technologies

There was an increased interest on the blending of non-traditional and traditional teaching and learning strategies but, compared to the 2004–2007 period, the focus here was on the former providing complementary online support. This emphasis, often a consequence of management and administrative imperatives, was on the use of self-directed learning activities that were either:

- directly related to the curriculum (Brack & Van Damme, 2010; Corbin & Karasmanis, 2010; Griffin, Gilchrist, & Thomson, 2009; Griffin & Thomson, 2008; Kennedy et al., 2009;¹⁶ Salter, Douglas, Pittaway, Swabey, & Capstick, 2010; Scutter & King, 2010; L. Walker, 2010; Re. Walker et al., 2010; Waycott & Kennedy, 2009), or
- associated with the curriculum—for example, assessment (Dobozy & Pospisil, 2008; Lilje & Peat, 2010), learning strategies (Adams et al., 2008; Bath & Bourke, 2010), and staff development (Lynch & Paasuke, 2010).

With enduring concerns that the development of a sense of belonging to a community of learners was becoming increasingly difficult due to, for example, (i) restrictions on space for students to socialise, (ii) larger classes, (iii) a more diverse student body, and (iv) increased online study, Sawyer and Scutter (2009) used a wiki successfully ‘to provide opportunities for ... students to interact and develop first virtual and then physical communities and academic and social networks’ (p. 603).

In conjunction with this increased interest in information and communication technologies (ICTs), there were more general investigations of electronic media such as the comparison of the young, technologically avid and literate ‘digital natives’ (essentially students) with older, less familiar and less ICT-literate ‘digital immigrants’ (staff) (G. Kennedy et al., 2008). While ‘some differences exist, the “digital divide” between students and staff is not nearly as large as some commentators would have us believe’ (p. 484). Indeed, according to another study during the same period, the 2008 students were less competent than a similar cohort in 1999 in areas such as databases and spreadsheets

¹⁶ For other publications associated with this ALTC project, see <http://www.netgen.unimelb.edu.au>.

(McLennan & Gibbs, 2008). E. Smith (2010) also cautioned that there are significant numbers of students in the DEEWR equity categories who ‘do not possess the digital literacy skills necessary to succeed within the current higher education context’ (p. 4). Krause and McEwen (2009) contended that findings such as these ‘challenge the myth of the “digital native” and further challenge practitioners and policy makers to ensure that the use of ICTs to enhance learning is underpinned by evidence-based best practice’ (p. 252). Having in mind a ‘whole-of-university approach to effectively inducting, engaging and retaining first year students engaged in e-learning’ (p. 251), Krause and McEwen began the development of a ‘Best Practice Framework to enhance student induction to e-learning in the first year’ (p. 251).

Curriculum-related activities

The increased presence of second generation approaches and of the Design and Engagement FYCPs manifested as reports on whole curriculum redesign (for example, Re. Walker et al., 2010) but more commonly as specific curriculum-related issues focused around:

- Teaching-learning processes

- the use of group processes, both face-to-face (Dane, 2010; Donnison & Masters, 2010; Pascoe, 2008) and virtual (McCarthy, 2009)
- engagement in large classes (Exeter et al., 2010; Kift & Field, 2009)
- a challenging interpretation of team teaching large classes that, among other things, provides ‘opportunities for students to join the team as teachers’ (Game & Metcalfe, 2009, p. 45)
- informal learning spaces (Dane, 2010; Matthews, Adams, & Gannaway, 2009)
- real-world experiences (G. Kennedy et al., 2009; Waycott & Kennedy, 2009; D. Wood, 2009; G. Wood & Petocz, 2008)
- a pedagogically sound global learning environment (Zeeng, Robbie, Markham-Adams, & Hutchison, 2009)
- problem-based learning, sometimes successful (Koppi, Nolan, & Field, 2010; Teakle, 2008), sometimes not (Papinczak, Young, Groves, & Haynes, 2008) and sometimes equivocal (Papinczak & Young, 2009; Pepper, 2010), even though it ‘was, in the main, challenging, time consuming and rewarding for the majority of students’ (Pepper, p. 693)

- a *just-in-time* approach to learning and teaching where a lecturer needs to ‘adapt to the first year experience *just before it happens, and as it is happening* [by being] pre-emptive and anticipatory ... rather than ... reactionary’ (Macken, 2009)
- self-directed learning activities (Adams et al., 2008; Griffin & Thomson, 2008; Rochecouste, Oliver, Mulligan, & Davies, 2010)
- a ‘cooperative teaching approach’ where the outcome was that ‘all members of the class were required to reflect on what was happening in meetings, on their own learning and the extent to which they were participating in both the class and their own learning’ (Kidman & Stevens, 2009, pp. 71, 75)
- novel practical class learning opportunities ‘where the activity was structured using familiar materials or processes in order to explain the unfamiliar’ (Stupans et al., 2009, p. 180)¹⁷
- the development and enhancement of student persistence ‘through the use of teaching and learning strategies with a focus on explicit teacher talk, reflection on learning, shared experiences and positive feedback’ (Huntly & Donovan, 2009, p. 1). J. McNamara, Field and Brown (2009) also discussed the importance of reflective practice
- using research to engage students through enquiry learning (W. Boyd et al., 2010; Koppi et al., 2010; D. Wood, 2010)
- the identification and implementation of a variety of teaching-learning models
 - ~ Knewstubb and Bond (2009) proposed a ‘communicative alignment’ (p. 181) model to conceptualise the relationship between a lecturer’s intentions and students’ understandings
 - ~ Werth, Southey and Lynch (2009) focused on four key pedagogical approaches of constructivism, scaffolding, social presence, and reflective practice, while
 - ~ K. Matthews, Moni and Moni (2010) identified six dimensions of practice that they demonstrated addressed the needs of diverse learners—aiding the transition into a new learning environment, blended learning communities, collaborative learning, differentiated instruction, scaffolding to guided student inquiry, and metacognitive learning strategies.

¹⁷ Who would have thought you could use a toilet roll that way!

- **Assessment**

- constructive alignment of assessment: (i) with learning objectives and teaching-learning strategies (K. Mathews et al., 2010; Potter & Lynch, 2008); and (ii) with ‘design principles of effective first year experience’ (Rayner & Cridland, 2009, p. 1)
- assessment and feedback associated with intentional first year curriculum design (R. Field & Kift, 2010; K. Mathews et al., 2010)
- models of assessment attuned to engaging with the evolving (J. Taylor, 2008) and diverse (Crowther, 2010) needs of first year students
- the communication of assessment tasks through a research-based and theoretically grounded 5-step process (Macken, 2010)
- the use of wikis as a pedagogical technique for collaborative assessment (Benckendorff, 2009)
- “just-in-time” virtual assignment help for novice students’ (Dobozy & Pospisil, 2008, p. 269)
- ‘theoretical and practical approaches ... to ... harnessing assessment and feedback practices to support early student learning, success and retention’ (Kift & Moody, 2009, p. 11)
- the suitability of peer and self-assessment—elements of a ‘mixed mode’ approach raised by D. Morgan in 2003—for students and programs at first year level (Nulty, 2010).
- library skills for academic success (Gross & Dobozy, 2009)
- embedding graduate attributes in first year (Sanson, 2009), specifically embedding academic and professional communication skills in the curriculum (Bamforth, 2010; Lawrence, Loch, & Galligan, 2010; Murray, 2010; Schier, Mulvany, & Shaw, 2010)
- nurturing critical thinking and independent study skills (Adam, Hartigan, & Brown, 2010).

Although focusing specifically on information literacy, Lupton (2008) raises an issue relevant to all literacies: Are they generic or situated within a context? She found that ‘information literacy incorporates both generic and situated aspects; that is, [there are] those aspects that are universal, and those that are contextual’ (p. 413).

This plethora of curriculum-based activities was based in the main in specific subjects and, to a lesser extent, across programs and faculties.

Staff development

Underpinning these curriculum activities was an appreciation of the need for associated staff development activities (Sankey & Lawrence, 2008; Teakle, 2008) which Wahr, Gray and Radloff (2009) claimed ‘needed to encourage, support and validate academics’ active, evidence-based understanding of and response to the student experience’ (p. 434). And this seemed to be best achieved through collaborative activities in communities of practice. Quinn, Smith, Duncan, Clarke and Nelson (2009) reported positive professional development outcomes in their discussion of the evolution of a community of practice of coordinators of large first year core subjects while Burnett and Larmar (2008) outlined a team approach to the professional development of first year advisors as part of an institution-wide approach to improving the FYE. There was also an example of how the process of collaboratively developing curriculum designed to facilitate first year student retention and engagement increased the staff’s own engagement, motivation and teaching practice as a community of practice emerged (Donnison, Edwards, Itter, Martin, & Yager, 2009).

Possibly the most ambitious attempt to develop a community of practice was at the sector level in Australia by MacGillvray and Wilson (2008). Their aim was to ‘develop national capacity and networking in cross-disciplinary mathematics and statistics learning support to enhance

- **Knowledge and skills**

The importance of:

- understanding the nature of disciplinary knowledge (L. Burton, Taylor, Dowling, & Lawrence, 2009; Chu, Treagust, & Chandrasegaran, 2008; J. Clark, 2009; E. Smith, 2010), as acknowledged earlier by Read et al. (2005)
- contextualising abstract discipline knowledge (Gibson-van Marrewijk et al., 2008)
- appreciating the relationship between individuals’ core epistemological beliefs and their beliefs about learning (Brownlee, Walker, Lennox, Exley, & Pearce, 2009)
- academic literacies in acquiring content knowledge (Hamlett, 2010; Larcombe & Malkin, 2008; Scouller, Bonanno, Smith, & Krass, 2008; E. Smith, 2010; Zhang et al., 2010)

student learning and confidence' (p. 3). They claimed that their project 'brought together knowledge, awareness, understanding and resources to build leadership capacity and a national community of practice' (p. 3) and cited first year case studies in chemistry (Kennett, 2007, cited in MacGillivray & Wilson, 2008) and engineering (MacGillivray & Cuthbert, 2003, cited in MacGillivray & Wilson, 2008).

Collaborative activities other than communities of practice were also deemed to be useful for professional development. Partnerships of complementary expertise was a commonly used model. Zhang et al. (2010), in trying to cater for the diverse language needs of science students, utilised co-teaching or peer coaching by science and education/language specialists. Truvert (2010) described a teaching development program that was a composite of the informal peer observation of teaching and the more formal but still collaborative third party observation of teaching methods to review in-class teaching practices of sessional staff and showed that the program improved teaching practices. As final examples, Lawrence et al. (2010) reported on how interdisciplinary collaboration was used successfully in the development of a first year undergraduate nursing curriculum and Brown and Adam (2009) used interdisciplinary teams to develop and share models of student FYE.

Consistent with this collaborative approach to staff development, Scutter and Wood (2009), in advocating an 'integrated approach to course development and strategies for improving the quality of courses designed to enhance the first-year learning experience' (p. 357), reported on 'the design and development of an online peer review system and associated website to provide a scaffold for the development and evaluation of curriculum materials' (p. 358). It 'harnessed the collective wisdom of academics through communal processes involving reflective practice and the sharing of resources and exemplars' (p. 357).

Another study focusing on staff development included the development and use of resources to facilitate a consensus moderation activity for tutors with the aim of establishing an agreed standard for a first year presentation (Kerr & Amirthalingam, 2010).

All of the above activities had the ultimate aim of fostering student engagement, a particular focus over this period due in some measure to the annual AUSSE data collections and reports. Student engagement was defined by Hu and Kuh as 'the quality of effort students themselves

devote to educationally purposeful activities that contribute directly to desired outcomes' (cited in Krause & Coates, 2008, p. 493). The work reported by Krause and Coates, along with attempts at developing, validating and reporting on the measurement of the construct (Carr, Hagel, & Hellier, 2010; S. Richardson & Coates, 2010), highlighted 'the multifaceted nature of student engagement' (Krause & Coates, p. 503). This multidimensionality, also acknowledged by Zepke and colleagues (Zepke & Leach, 2010b; Zepke, Leach, & Butler, 2010), was reflected in the following topics, all of which relate to some aspect of the engagement construct.

The articulation of the engagement construct

Expectations

First year students' expectations received considerable attention. In some studies, expectations were secondary to the main focus. For example, Bamforth (2010) in investigating the impact of embedding a generic skills program into the curriculum, noted in passing that students had unrealistic expectations of their skill level. However, most studies on expectations focused explicitly on them. Crisp et al. (2009) proposed that expectations *per se* be explored in order that staff could 'use the responses for a constructive dialogue and work towards a more positive alignment between perceived expectations, ... the realities of available resources ... [and] standard university practices' (pp. 12, 14). For example, Edwards (2010) suggested that the 'management of student expectations during the implementation [of criterion-referenced assessment (CRA)] would greatly influence student perceptions of the value of CRA' (para. 1). However, most researchers in this area, consistent with investigations earlier in the decade—Barker (2000), Vardi (2000) and C. Johnston (2001)—actually explored the expectation–reality nexus. Luzeckyj, Burke da Silva, Scutter, Palmer and Brinkworth (2010), building on the earlier work of Crisp et al. (2009) and Brinkworth, McCann, Mathews and Nordström (2009), are just starting to report on a multi-site study 'addressing the gaps between student expectations and experience' (Luzeckyj et al., p. 2).

Van der Meer, Jansen and Torenbeek (2010) explored first year students' expectations of and experiences with time management. Although they found that many students were realistic about having to plan their work independently and to spend considerable time studying,

they also found that ‘many students found it difficult to regulate their self-study and keep up with the work’ (p. 777), suggesting the need for universities to take a more proactive role in helping students ‘to make sense of time management’ (p. 777).

Van Rensburg, Danaher and van Rensburg (2010), using an autoethnographic case study design unique to this review, explored the expectation-reality mismatch of the first author’s reflections on his FYE, suggesting ‘implications of the [expectation-reality] notion for different stakeholders in managing the potential mismatch’ (p. 8). P. McLaughlin and Mills (2009) used semi-structured interviews with a small volunteer sample (n=12) to compare students’ espoused learning needs with their actual experiences and identified considerable mismatch. For example, ‘students favoured collaborative social spaces for learning and technology exchange’ (p. 13), while ‘the physical set-up of the formal tutorial rooms was threatening ... not encouraging social learning or learning models that were student-centred’ (p. 11).

Using a more conventional survey methodology with close to 700 students, K. Nelson, Kift and Clarke (2008) investigated the nexus over one semester—expectations in week 1 versus reality in week 13. While finding the relationship complex, they identified a key issue related to engagement: ‘while the students felt they had a satisfying experience, they had high expectations about wanting to learn but felt that these expectations were not adequately met’ (p. 2), a finding that resonates with C. Johnston’s (2001) study. The authors suggested ‘the need to focus on the development of learning and metacognitive skills, ... particularly in the early stages of engagement’ (p. 6).

Using a similar model of comparing expectations (orientation week) and realities (at six and 18 months), Brinkworth et al. (2009) surveyed around 200 students and again found complexity but enough consistency across different degree programs (humanities and sciences) to recommend ‘non-specialised transition programs to meet the needs of first year students and facilitate the transition from secondary to tertiary education’ (p. 157). There was some evidence of such programs: Surjan et al. (2010) discussed the ongoing development and implementation of an ‘interprofessional course ... to provide commencing students with a transitional period, inclusive of academic, social and administrative support’ (p. 1), while O’Shea and Lysaght (2010) reported on a peer-led transition program designed to ‘socialise

new students into the university culture’ (p. 7) having ‘revealed a tangible “gap” between how ... [the students] perceived university study and what they actually encountered’ (p. 1). McPhail, Fisher and McConachie (2009) went a step further, using an intervention program on tertiary study ‘to align these perceptions more accurately with reality’ (p. 7). This ‘gap’ was used by Willcoxson (2010) to explain first year attrition. The likelihood of withdrawal from studies due to the lack of effort and preparation reported by students ‘may reflect a failure on the part of students to understand expectations or on the part of teachers to clarify expectations or use strategies that elicit the behaviours they desire’ (p. 627).

At-risk students

A focus on at-risk students started to emerge with a concomitant increase in institution-wide activities rather than being subject, program or faculty based. Some writers simply acknowledged the link between low engagement and high attrition (for example, Jackling & Natoli, 2010), while others were more proactive and either reported on or recommended the identification and support of students at risk of not engaging or of disengaging. There were some laudable attempts at this earlier in the decade (Powell & Peel, 2000), but the reports appearing in this year cluster are institution-wide and/or provide evidence of sustainability. K. Wilson and Lizzio (2008) classified first year students who failed or marginally passed their first piece of university assessment as ‘at-risk’ and, using a just-in-time intervention to develop self-management and problem-solving capabilities, produced ‘higher rates of submission and pass rates for the second assessment item’ (p. 1). The ‘five senses of success’ model (Lizzio, 2006) identified earlier and the ‘student lifecycle’ (Higher Education Academy, 2001) provided the theoretical underpinnings of this ‘effective and sustainable first-year student experience’ (K. Wilson, 2009, p. 1) while operationally, first year advisors had a crucial role in the intervention. This approach was replicated successfully elsewhere by Potter and Parkinson (2010).

Carlson, Scarbrough and Carlson (2009) and K. Nelson, Duncan and Clarke (2009) developed a holistic intervention and monitoring strategy that, in both cases, ‘sought to provide proactive intervention and support to first year students who are identified at risk’ (Carlson et al., p. 67). K. Nelson et al. drew on the Carlson et al. model, modifying it to be congruent with the philosophy, policies and practices of the first year experience

program at their institution, and developed the Student Success Project (SSP). In both programs, students are proactively contacted by telephone by discipline-experienced and trained later-year students to provide advice and/or referral to specialist services to students classified as at-risk based on a variety of criteria such as failing or not submitting an assessment. The Carlson et al. program has been operating since 2003 and 'students who accessed any student support service were more successful than students who accessed none' (p. 68). The SSP has been operating since 2008 and has consistently 'facilitated both the persistence and academic performance' (K. Nelson et al., p. 4) of those contacted and shown to be of considerable financial benefit to the institution (Marrington, Nelson, & Clarke, 2010).

Scouller et al. (2008), working in the area of academic literacies and using the premise that 'early identification of students at risk of failure should be part of first-year monitoring ... procedures, in order to provide students with the support they need in a timely fashion' (p. 177), recommended that students be provided with 'specific and easily accessible opportunities to develop different aspects of their writing, either as part of the curriculum and assessment feedback frameworks, or as adjunct support' (p. 177). Concrete examples of this are reported by Larcombe and Malkin (2008), Brown, Adam, Douglas and Skalicky (2009) and H. Johnston, Duff and Quinn (2009). Larcombe and Malkin used 'relatively standard in class exercises [which] were effective in identifying a group of [Law] students with writing "difficulties"' (p. 319). The students were referred to support that impacted positively on their end-of-semester results. An interesting outcome of the study was that almost half of those referred were domestic students and the authors cautioned that English language testing of international students was not sufficient to identify all students likely to need or benefit from support programs. They recommended that 'institutions adopt measures that assess the communication skills of all commencing students' (p. 320). However, Lu, Yao, Chin, XIAO and Xu (2010, pp. 97, 98) reported:

... that international students experience significant cross-cultural and language difficulties in their learning process. ... Apart from the cultural and language problems, the study found that unfamiliar environment, different teaching methods and culture shock were the main difficulties experienced by first-year international students.

These findings resonate with an earlier study by Sawir, Marginson, Deumert, Nyland and Ramia (2008), who identified not only personal and social loneliness in international students but also what they called 'cultural loneliness, triggered by the absence of the preferred cultural and/or linguistic environment' (p. 148).

Brown et al. (2009), evaluating an initiative where individual student appointments were offered to students who self-reported academic issues with their university studies, concluded that individual appointments allowed tailoring 'to specific needs of students, and hence can cater very well for individual differences. The appointments often meet "just in time needs" and are contextually based and relevant to the student' (pp. 7–8). Also addressing student needs but focusing specifically on the Net Generation preference for web 2.0 social communication processes, H. Johnston et al. (2009) explored, with sufficient success to 'encourage further work, ... the potential of social software to allow us add value to our teaching by making it more accessible and relevant to students' (p. 36). As opposed to the academic focus of Scouller et al. (2008), Rienks and Taylor (2009), responding to an economic imperative, made the case for using only administration data collected on admission to define 'at-risk' students but indicated that the 'risk factors' were only indicators of 'potential risk, not markers of definite risk' (p. 3).

Other ongoing issues

Co-curricular activities

While there was the increased interest in second generation approaches, co-curricular activities were still being reported in the areas of orientation (Parappilly, Quinton, & Andersson, 2009; Simeoni, 2009) and peer support activities (Armstrong, Campbell, & Brogan, 2009; Burke da Silva & Auburn, 2009; Godfrey, 2008; Nash, 2009; Stanley & Lapsley, 2008; van der Meer & Scott, 2008, 2009). The Simeoni study highlighted the 'complexity of the task at hand and the fact that no-one-plan-fits-all' (p. 9). This conclusion was reflected in the development and implementation of a plethora of intervention programs that had the overall aim of facilitating engagement, but addressed the achievement of that aim through a variety of co-curricular issues such as:

- facilitating the uptake of academic support services (Darroch & Rainsbury, 2009)
- highlighting the need for more social/emotional support services (Douglass & Islam, 2009)

- exploring awareness of cultural, gender, sexual and economic diversity (Kirby, Dluzewska, & Andrews, 2009)
- training in either profession-related communication skills (H. Johnston et al., 2009; McKauge et al., 2009) or the more general interpersonal communication skills (S. Morgan, 2009)
- aligning tertiary study expectations with reality (McPhail et al., 2009) and improving time-management (Thiele, 2008).

These programs ranged from one-hour sessions to half- or full-semester involvement with often the former programs predictably producing non-significant outcomes.

In the area of peer support, Arkoudis et al. (2010, p. 6), in exploring the benefits of, and obstacles to, interaction among students from diverse cultural and linguistic backgrounds:

... highlighted the potential benefit of peer interaction for learning across diverse cultural and linguistic groups. From both the students' and staffs' perspectives, interaction among students from diverse backgrounds potentially led to: increased awareness and understanding of different perspectives; better preparation for the workplace; improved English language skills of international students; and a greater feeling of belonging.

They did not develop a formal program but described 'a range of ... teaching practices and learning experiences ... [which] tap into the potential benefits of our diverse student communities' (Arkoudis et al., 2010, p. 6). In probably the most powerful conclusion of the impact of peers on student engagement, W. Clark (2009, p. 3), synthesising his own New Zealand-based and other international research, demonstrated that:

... undeniably, those students who work and socialize together are more likely to succeed, and are more likely to continue with their studies, and a wide range of research suggests that students are best served by a learning environment in which they can interact meaningfully with other students.

Students' individual characteristics

There was also an ongoing but limited interest in the influence of individual characteristics such as personality, personal goals and approaches to learning on engagement behaviour (L. Burton et al., 2009; Kinnear, Boyce, Sparrow, Middleton, & Cullity, 2009; Papinczak & Young, 2009; Papinczak et al., 2008). For the first time, the influence of gender was an explicit focus (Dancer

& Kamvounias, 2008). A connected focus related to: (i) the motivation underpinning program selection and career aspirations which indicated personal, pedagogical and pragmatic reasons (Kinnear et al.; Leach & Zepke, 2010; Nulty & Müller, 2009); and (ii) engagement, influenced differentially by competence, autonomy and relatedness needs (Zepke et al., 2010).

Generational approaches

Up to this point, there has been quite a lengthy discussion on aspects related to the second generation approach that dominates this period through the curriculum-related issues, the associated staff development and their combined impact on student engagement. However, it is important in tracing the evolution of approaches to catering for the FYE, to note that there was a surge in third generation activities in this period, moving from five items each in 2000–2003 and 2004–2007 to 16 in 2008–2010.

This quantitative evolution also reflected a qualitative change. The items in the 2000–2003 period reported work in progress on developing an institution-wide holistic and coordinated approach to supporting first year students, some operational to varying degrees (Emmitt et al., 2002; Kantanis, 2000b), but the others at a conceptual level only (McInnis, 2001; McLoughlin, 2002; Pitkethly & Prosser, 2001).

In the 2004–2007 period, there were again relatively few items, but they had a significant impact on activities in the subsequent period. Perhaps the most influential paper was by Kift and Nelson (2005) that introduced the term *transition pedagogy* as a manifestation of the third generation approach. This was operationalised in an extensive report on FYE (Kift, 2007) where an institution-wide implementation of the tenet that 'successful transition of our students is everybody's responsibility' (p. 5) was proposed.

Still at the institutional level, Zepke and colleagues addressed the influence of complementary integrative and adaptive discourses on student outcomes (Zepke & Leach, 2005, 2007; Zepke et al., 2005). The items in the current period, however, were substantially different in that, building on the stimulus provided by the introduction of the *transition pedagogy* concept in 2005, they were in the main reporting on robust, functioning institution-wide programs (ALTC, 2009b; Carlson et al., 2009; Kift, 2009a, 2009b; Kift et al., 2010; Marrington et al., 2010; K. Nelson et al., 2009; K. Wilson, 2009). In addition to these empirically-based items, there were also substantive conceptual/theoretical

discussions (Budge, 2010), significant keynote addresses (Devlin, 2008, 2009; Gale, 2009) and sociopolitical determinants of policy for the sector (Australian Government Department of Education, Employment and Workplace Relations [DEEWR], 2009; Bradley et al., 2008; Cullen, 2006).¹⁸ The latter were of considerable significance for the higher education sector and were highly influential on theorising and action during this period.

Widening participation

The explicit focus on widening participation and equity issues of the Bradley Report and subsequent federal government policies in Australia (DEEWR, 2009) and the implementation of TES-2 in New Zealand manifested, particularly but not only in 2010, as reports of initiatives involving samples of students from:

- special entry paths such as vocational entry (Whittington & Thompson, 2010)
- LSES groups (Devlin, 2009; Scull & Cuthill, 2010)
- non-English speaking backgrounds (Johnson, 2008; Kearney & Donaghy, 2010; Lu et al., 2010; Murray, 2010; Rochecouste et al., 2010)
- rural backgrounds (N. Ellis, 2010)
- first in family status (O'Shea & Lysaght, 2010)

with specific programs or focus on:

- Australian Indigenous (Devlin, 2009; Syron & McLaughlin, 2010)
- Māori and/or Pasifika (Airini et al., 2010; C. Ross, circa 2008–2009; van der Meer, Scott, & Neha, 2010; F. White, 2009)
- mature-age populations (L. Burton et al., 2009; Henderson, Noble, & De George-Walker, 2009)
- outstanding ('honours program') students (Fisher, McPhail, & McConachie, 2009)
- 'English language competency ... the language needs of both native speaker and non-native speaker students' (Murray, 2010, p. 55).

That Murray's concern is valid is reflected in Johnson's (2008) disturbing statistic that 'all [international] students estimated that in their first year of study they had understood between 20 and 30 per cent of lecture content' (p. 235).

From a broader perspective, a study predicting first year university results from secondary school performance (Shulruf, Hattie, & Tumen, 2008) proposed a merit-based admissions system that 'would maintain the success rates in the student body, while increasing the number of students from under-represented groups at the university without lowering the chances of their success' (p. 696). General discussions around widening participation, equity and associated issues were very much in evidence (for example, Budge, 2010; Devlin, 2008, 2009, 2010; Gale, 2009; Martin-Lynch, 2010; Skene & Evamy, 2009) along with more focused studies embedded in this broadened access and increased diversity context such as Foster's (2010) exploration of the 'relative contribution of teachers to attrition and performance' (p. 317).

Other issues began to emerge during this period. Implicitly related to widening participation were: transition programs that introduced secondary students to university life by enabling later-year secondary school students to study university programs (for example, R. White, 2010); the recognition of pre-university influences on university attrition such as the 'disparity between learning areas in school curricula' (Wright, 2010, p. 21) and explorations of student experiences *per se*—academic advising (Buissink-Smith, Spronken-Smith, & Walker, 2010) and transition and engagement (Reid & Solomonides, 2010). Finally, and perhaps significantly for the continued evolution and maturation of discourse and research on the FYE, there was also the beginnings of discussions about third generation approaches to the FYE (ALTC, 2009b; Kift, 2009a; Kift et al., 2010;) with the identification of *transition pedagogy* as a manifestation of the third generation approach (Kift, 2009a; Kift et al., 2010).

¹⁸ With regard to TES-2, see also <http://www.minedu.govt.nz/NZEducation/EducationPolicies/TertiaryEducation/PolicyAndStrategy/TertiaryEducationStrategy/PartThreeExpectations.aspx#jump1>.

Summary of the 2008–2010 period

There was a dramatic increase in the amount of FYE literature available in the 2008–2010 period, mainly due to an exponential increase in second generation activities, particularly in specific curriculum-focused approaches, many subject based though some program based,¹⁹ aimed at facilitating student engagement and staff development. Promoting student engagement by utilising and clarifying expectations and monitoring student at-risk behaviour emerged as significant areas of interest while, particularly in 2009–2010, attention in Australia was focused on the widening participation agenda and in New Zealand on realigning higher education with social and economic policy. These issues reflected growth in a university-wide focus for research along with an explicit focus on non-traditional and equity cohorts. Serious attempts to operationalise the third generation approach to catering for the FYE through a transition pedagogy—an institution-wide holistic and coordinated approach to supporting first year students—highlighted the end of the period under review.

¹⁹ Concentrated in the main in the program-based case studies and other resources collected under the auspices of Kift's ALTC Senior Fellowship (2009a) and available at <http://www.fyhe.qut.edu.au/transitionpedagogy>.

Downloaded Copy



Chapter 5

Learning from the literature

For a variety of pragmatic and substantive reasons, the decade under review was divided into year clusters to facilitate a discussion of the literature in Chapters 2, 3 and 4. In this chapter, the literature is considered in its entirety with, initially, an exploration of trends across the whole decade.

Possibly the most obvious trend across the decade was the increase in the number and range of literature items, a strong indicator of the growth in interest in the FYE as an area for serious study. What is particularly significant, however, is that this quantitative change has been accompanied by qualitative changes in many of the various aspects of the FYE, reflecting an evolving sophistication in how the aspects are conceptualised and operationalised. This maturation manifested itself most dramatically in the movement across the decade from a focus on first generation approaches (co-curricular activities) to a focus on second generation approaches (curricular activities) while maintaining an ongoing exploration of the former.

Accompanying and intimately related to the generational evolution was the gradual emergence of the FYCPs: first Transition followed by Design and Engagement, then Assessment and finally the remaining two, Diversity, and Evaluation and monitoring. This strong curriculum focus was reflected in a plethora of student-centred curriculum innovations and assessment practices enabling active and collaborative learning. Of possible concern were the relatively limited instances of the Diversity, and Evaluation and monitoring principles.

With regard to the co-curricular activities, some strong and recurrent themes were manifest:

- a strong and ongoing interest in peer programs in both their formal (for example, SI, PALS and PASS) and less formal (for example, orientation mentors) modes

- a similar but slightly less evident interest in orientation with the significant change over the decade related to conceptualising orientation—not just a one-off o-week phenomenon but an ongoing intra-semester activity
- an increasing interest in: (i) identifying and developing the various literacies required by commencing students; and (ii) understanding the discourses inherent in the university culture
- spasmodic, relatively small and seemingly reducing interest in the influence of individual personality and behavioural characteristics on behaviour and performance in first year, perhaps with the exception of the exploration of student expectations and their nexus with reality.

Further, *within* considerations of the first generation approaches, there was also a qualitative change from identifying, describing and providing co-curricular activities (for example, orientation activities) to developing and implementing intervention programs to develop and/or improve the co-curricular skills (for example, professional communication skills). And, *beyond* the first and second generations, and especially evident towards the end of the decade, there were the beginnings of discussions about a third generation approach with transition pedagogy identified as a manifestation of this desirable whole-of-institution transformation.

Beneath the generational evolution, there was an ongoing undercurrent of activity replicating information about basic concepts—attrition, retention, engagement etc. For example, discussions about retention and engagement were evidenced by Macdonald (2000), Anderson and McCrea (2005) and Woodbridge and Osmond (2009). The 'replication' can, however, be justified by context-specificity (Anderson & McCrea) and the usefulness of outcome—

for example, Woodbridge and Osmond found that human service students 'experienced the same types of impacts on retention as research in other fields has reported' (p. 4).

The focus on first year cohorts in general was, as would be expected, consistent across the decade, while explicit focus on specific equity groups, although limited, increased towards the final year cluster.

Other trends:

- With regard to students, there was an increasing interest in
 - adopting a *holistic* (academic, social, emotional) view of students
 - the needs of specific subgroups
 - identifying and supporting students classified as being at-risk of not engaging or disengaging.
- With regard to staff, there was an increase in:
 - the implementation of dedicated first year staff development activities, including attention to the needs of sessional staff, but relatively little consideration directed to staff development for professional/non-academic staff
 - the appearance of specialist first year roles, for example, first year advisors
 - the use of communities of practice
 - the exploration of mechanisms to enable cross-institutional partnerships between academic and professional staff.

With regard to programs, there was an increasing acceptance of the importance of adopting a whole-of-institution approach to FYE activities and programs. Stone (2005) reflects many commentators' views when she commented that 'first year retention programs can lose their effectiveness when they exist alone, rather than as an integrated, campus-wide strategy' (p. 33). Similarly, Krause and her colleagues, commenting in the third of the CSHE's quinquennial reports on the Australian FYE, observed:

First year support efforts have tended to be piecemeal in the main, developed and sustained by individuals or small groups who champion the cause of first year transition. We have now reached the stage where universities must recognise the need for institution-wide approaches to enhancing the first year experience.

(Krause et al., 2005, para. 8.8.6)

A corollary of this activity was the bringing together of academic, professional and administrative stakeholders to plan and implement programs and the concomitant emergence of senior academic FYE leadership.

With regard to context, institutions and staff have had to increasingly adjust to:

- augmented management and administrative imperatives
- the necessity to manage, assimilate, analyse and then formulate action based on multiple sources of local and national data regarding students and their FYE
- increased diversity of commencing cohorts
- shifting standards for entry
- larger classes
- increased online learning
- casualisation of staff profile.

In sum, 'a massified system with fewer resources' (Crosling, Heagney, & Thomas, 2009, p. 16).

Prediction versus practice

In 2001, McInnis²⁰ reviewed the state of research into the FYE at that time, nominated some concerns and suggested a number of possible research directions. In this section, McInnis' views are compared with evidence arising from this review.

Concerns

In 2001, McInnis observed that there were very few scholars specialising in the study of higher education but acknowledged the impact of the four Pacific Rim First Year in Higher Education Conferences from 1995 to 2000 and the potential for the conference to provide a forum for just such a specialisation. This review has identified a quite dramatic increase in FYE literature, particularly in recent years, reflecting a growing corpus of researchers specialising in FYE pedagogy and practice. It is reasonable to assume a symbiotic relationship between this growth and the increasing popularity of the Pacific Rim First Year in Higher Education Conference and the launch of a dedicated journal, the *International Journal of the First Year in Higher Education*. McInnis was also concerned that there were too many 'fragments of research' (p. 112) dominated by practitioners' reports of specific, contextualised and non-generalisable FYE strategies.

²⁰ All references to McInnis in this section come from McInnis (2001).

The constancy of the incidence of first generation approaches across the decade indicates that a significant number of researchers have focused and are still focusing on activities *around* or *in aid of* the curriculum rather than *within* it. As Kift (2009a, p. 9) has identified:

The concern is that if we do not come in from the periphery (for example, of de-contextualised, 'bolt-on' skills courses) and harness the curriculum as the academic and social 'organising device'— as the 'glue that holds knowledge and the broader student experience together' (McInnis, 2001, 9, 11)—student take-up of our otherwise disparate and 'piecemeal' efforts to support their FYE (Krause et al., 2005, para. 8.8.6) is left to chance. Put simply, the curriculum is what students have in common, is within our institutional control, and is where time-poor students are entitled to expect academic and social relevance, support and engagement.

The high number of subject-based studies further reflects this intra-institutional, possibly siloed, research focus and an ongoing trend of reporting successful strategies. The dilemma is that such strategies are in demand from frontline academic and professional staff for transferable application at the staff–student interface, as shown in this review by the increasing popularity of communities of practice as a staff development resource for these colleagues. However, the fact that the incidence of second generation approaches has increased exponentially indicates that, relatively speaking, the *bolt-on* co-curricular approach is attracting less attention. Also, the emergence of interest in the third generation approach, manifesting as *transition pedagogy*, provides the potential stimulus for a whole-of-institution research focus.

Part of the rationale for undertaking this review was an underlying assumption that FYE research and researchers were *on the cusp*. This review has proven that hypothesis and has demonstrated that the study of the FYE is now well established in Australasia as a core business focus for tertiary practitioners—both academic and professional—and more broadly for institutional managers, administrators and policy developers. Post-2010, Australasian FYE research and practice is indeed on the cusp as it responds to the developing sociopolitical context of transformation of the higher education system with ambitious global agendas in Australia to move from a mass to a universal system, and in New Zealand to reform the sector as the foundation for a knowledge-based economy.

To move on productively from this point, however, there is a particular need for new researchers to resist the temptation to reinvent the wheel and to progress beyond the still prevalent fragmented siloed focus to a university-wide vision that the facilitating framework of a transition pedagogy encourages. This could be operationalised by inter-professional teams implementing institution-wide projects consisting of a series of small but integrated sub-projects. Communities of practice, with aims and foci expanded to include action research and practitioner-researcher paradigms, could well provide a sustainable vehicle for such activities.

Future research

Within the context of aiming for generalisable outcomes, McInnis identified the following as areas for future research:

- the value of diversity
- comparative studies
- longitudinal studies
- research on teaching, learning and assessment
- the nature of the undergraduate curriculum.

Each focus is considered in turn.

Diversity

While agreeing that the impact of diversity on students' experience is not adequately understood, McInnis felt that what was needed were studies of how diversity adds value to the FYE for all students. The review identified some evidence of such considerations early in the decade and a plethora of studies post-Bradley/TES-2 that have involved designated non-traditional and equity groups. However, the relatively low incidence of literature items that address the Diversity FYCP indicates that dedicated studies investigating how best to cater for diversity through the curriculum were rare. In the contemporary context of Australasian higher education, such investigations are critical to ensuring the quality of the experience for non-traditional cohorts and provide significant research opportunities.

McInnis also highlighted the nexus between increased participation and diversity, with the concomitant impact of and on large classes, and related issues around student readiness, adjustment and the need to adapt teaching approaches. The review identified numerous examples of innovative approaches to teaching, including teaching large classes, aimed at facilitating engagement. The issue of student preparedness for tertiary study, although acknowledged conceptually, has received limited empirical attention to date with perhaps the exception of studies on the influence of personality characteristics (see, for example, the 'Students' individual characteristics' sections in Chapters 2 and 4). This is a somewhat restricted focus and a specific indicator of the more general paucity of treatment of the Diversity FYCP. Robust research and theorising around the indicia of inclusive curriculum design and careful exploration of effective and efficient mechanisms for catering for and utilising diversity through the curriculum provide a wealth of research opportunities.

Comparative studies

McInnis suggested that, as new research agendas emerge in countries that are moving towards mass participation in tertiary education, comparative studies should become more popular due to benchmarking imperatives. The only comparative perspectives identified in the review were available in the seven (two international) case studies and in the 17 expert commentaries on the cases (four international) which formed the initial evidence base of Kift's ALTC Senior Fellowship²¹ investigating national and international first year curriculum design (Kift, 2009a). Indeed, the 17 expert commentaries not only compared how each case addressed each particular aspect of design (for example, engaging pedagogies, academic skills, staff development) but also compared trends in each of these areas of focus. The identification of international partners and the subsequent development of collaborative studies of mutual benefit is an area of potential future research.

Longitudinal studies

McInnis claimed that there was a need for longitudinal studies to follow cohorts from the school years through to, at least, the completion of the first degree. The only longitudinal studies utilised in the review were the trend surveys reported in both the quinquennial reports from the CSHE and the annual AUSSE data

collections, and some small cohort surveys in several expectation-reality studies where students were re-contacted after periods up to 18 months.²² There were the beginnings of interest in introducing secondary students to university experiences by enabling later-year secondary school students to study university programs. This scenario is a specific example of the broader alternative pathways concept, which also includes recruitment of second-chance learners. Both of these would provide the opportunity for more sophisticated longitudinal studies in the form of cohort and panel surveys and case studies.

Teaching, learning and assessment

McInnis hoped that the growing demand for a more accurate evaluation of teaching outcomes in universities would generate more scholarly research on teaching, learning and assessment. The dramatic increase in second generation curriculum-based approaches towards the end of the decade was a reflection of a greater focus on teaching, learning and assessment. However, the relatively low incidences of the implementation of three of the FYCPs—Diversity, Assessment, and Evaluation and monitoring—indicates that, up until now, researchers have had more of an interest in and focus on designing curriculum to facilitate mainstream transition and engagement with limited follow through in constructive alignment or to the evaluation stage. This is possibly a reflection of a dual practitioner-researcher and a researcher-practitioner orientation and doubtless has grown out of the transference of first generation approaches to the curriculum context. Taking a more comprehensive approach to curriculum development by completing the curriculum development → implementation → evaluation cycle provides another research opportunity.

Focus on the curriculum

McInnis felt that the nature of the undergraduate curriculum was being overlooked due to the emphasis on students, instruction and support. There were two important and related developments during the decade that addressed this issue. First, the recognition of the central

²¹ See footnote 15 and associated section in Chapter 4.

²² It is acknowledged that other relevant longitudinal studies do exist. Examples: (i) the Longitudinal Surveys of Australian Youth (LSAY), an extensive research program that tracks young people as they move from school to post-school destinations (see a review in Australian Council for Educational Research, 2008); and (ii) Long, Ferrier and Heagney (2006), a study that examined the enrolment pattern of a national first year university sample 12 months after enrolment in 2004.

role of curriculum in facilitating transition, leading to the emergence of transition pedagogy as a third generation approach to understanding the FYE; and second, the groundbreaking work of the development of the FYCPs and their subsequent operationalisation. These developments combined to place curriculum at the epicentre of commencing students' FYE. As mentioned earlier, transition pedagogy provides the framework for university-wide research opportunities with a curriculum or student learning focus.

Other topics

McInnis felt strongly that all of these future research directions needed a robust evaluative element and that there was a clear need for systematic research on the effectiveness of the innovations and intervention strategies aimed at improving the FYE. This need is still relevant as evidenced by the limited instances of the Evaluation and monitoring FYCP alluded to earlier. But the Australian Government's response to Bradley—the setting of participation and attainment targets, and the linking of performance-based funding to improvements in the student experience and achievement—has provided the impetus for an increased focus on evaluation. McInnis also felt that it was time to undertake a substantial reassessment of research questions about where university life fits with the personal lives of students, giving the specific example of the need to investigate students' perceptions of the relative importance of issues influencing the process of transition from school to university. The increased interest in and sophisticated application of student expectations data, particularly in the later years of the decade, is a tangible example of researchers beginning to ask such questions.

Finally, McInnis, observed that the investigation of the FYE was dominated by institutional, program and subject studies with little regard for the broader context and recommended acknowledgement of the influence of broader social structures. This is still a challenge as practitioners continue to seek understanding through evidence-based practice. However, there were the beginnings of contextualising the FYE with recognition of the sociopolitical influences on student engagement and indications that broader contextual factors beyond the control of individual students influenced retention and success.

Summarising

The last decade has seen considerable evidence of curriculum-based research that has focused on teaching, learning and assessment, an increasing interest in diversity interpreted mainly as a focus on non-traditional and equity cohorts, and the beginnings of a focus on transition pedagogy interpreted as a university-wide sustainable, integrated, coordinated, curriculum-mediated transition framework. However, a number of significant gaps or deficits in the research agenda have been identified.

The relatively underutilised FYCPs

This is a major gap in current literature and provides the possibility for substantial research activities. While the Transition, Design and Engagement FYCPs are being addressed regularly, the Diversity, Assessment, and Evaluation and monitoring principles are not. Some examples of possible research directions are:

- a broader application of the Diversity principle such as focusing through the curriculum on its value and inclusivity rather than seeing it as a deficit to be remedied
- applying the Assessment principle by continuing the current history of including assessment in the constructive alignment of curriculum activities and attending to the development of early assessment literacies
- enabling systematic evaluation and enhancement of practice through a rigorous application of the Evaluation and monitoring principle.

These future research directions, particularly the latter, would provide a sustainable compilation of evidence-based practice.

Comparative research

This form of research would involve the identification of international partners and the development of comparative and collaborative research projects.

Longitudinal research

With the increased focus on linking the secondary, vocational, further education and tertiary sectors comes the capacity to instigate more sophisticated longitudinal studies than have been carried out thus far.

Transition pedagogy

As mentioned earlier, the emergence of interest in the third generation approach, manifesting as *transition pedagogy*, provides the potential stimulus for a whole-of-institution research focus. Currently, the transition pedagogy concept provides the third level in the generational approach to understanding the FYE. However, while the generational model has been extremely useful in conceptualising FYE, it is essentially descriptive and possibly of limited use in future theorising.

There is a potentially richer alternative available in the Capability Maturity Model (CMM)²³ (Paulk, Weber, Curtis, & Chrissis, 1995). The model consists of a theoretical continuum of stages or *levels* along which *process maturity* can be described and developed incrementally from one level to the next. A CMM continuum typically has five maturity levels—Initial (for example, ad hoc), Repeatable, Defined, Managed and Optimized—and effectiveness is believed to improve as the organisation *matures* or moves up the levels. Each level reflects a particular capability and is characterised by unique *management processes* and an associated set of *common features* which manifest as *key practices*. It originated in software engineering (Humphrey, 1989) and has been applied to a variety of disciplines such as human resource management (Curtis, Hefley, & Miller, 2009), knowledge management (Kochikar, 2002) and in the education context as an e-learning maturity model (eMM) (Marshall & Mitchell, 2007). The level of maturity of the discipline of interest is determined by comparing key practices with the common features and management processes that describe each of the levels. This variety of applications indicates that the CMM concept is robust and flexible and provides the opportunity to extend beyond transition pedagogy at the institutional level (Level 3) to between institutions within a sector (Level 4) to between sectors (Level 5). Applying the CMM to the FYE would provide an abundance of research opportunities (Kift et al., 2010).²⁴

The implications for researchers and practitioners alike would seem clear: for FYE programs to flourish and produce generalisable, relevant

and sustainable outcomes, FYE researchers must avoid the promotion of siloed research activities and build on (and in turn grow) the evidence base and the good practice already in place. The literature analysed for this review strongly suggests that the optimal model for such initiatives is to have inter-professional researcher-practitioner teams collaborate to implement institution-wide projects, located within a relevant community of practice. The specific needs of individual team members should be able to be accommodated by having a series of small but integrated sub-projects contributing to the overall project.

The implications for institutions would also appear clear: of most importance is the responsibility for establishing institutional environments where the learning experience is mediated by a broadly conceived definition of curriculum, and student learning engagement is situated within this curriculum. The literature included in this review shows that to impact positively on first year student engagement, success and retention, institutions need to move away from relying on individual champions—who work locally to achieve so much—towards sustainable, embedded institutional programs focused on: (i) students' engagement in learning; (ii) proactive, timely access to support, which is part of the learning experience; and (iii) the fostering of a sense of belonging to peer groups, their role as a student, the university, professions and their future careers.

What has been learned?

In terms of what has been learned from this examination of Australasian literature, some meta-observations may be made.

The first is that, in our various jurisdictions, we are extremely fortunate to have been well served by access to systematic and longitudinal examinations of the FYE: for example, in Australia, the quinquennial reports emanating from the CSHE since 1995; in New Zealand via the regular and frequent meta-analyses produced by Zepke, Leach and colleagues; and most recently across Australasia, the annual AUSSE data collections and reports. These works have ably tracked the changing FYE dynamic over critical periods of sectoral growth and expansion. For many early Australasian researchers and practitioners, these data have provided the critical evidence-base required to argue for and promote good and reflective practice, often in the absence of accessible institutional data available for that necessary purpose.

²³ Service mark—a trademark that identifies a service rather than a product—owned by Carnegie Mellon University.

²⁴ An ALTC-sponsored multi-institution project *Establishing a framework for transforming student engagement, success and retention in higher education institutions* (K. Nelson & Clarke, 2011) is addressing this. It aims to develop a Capability Maturity Model for Student Engagement, Success and Retention.

More latterly, such reports have also been useful to identify gaps in individual institutional data and have reinforced the need to be ever conscious of individual institutional difference signifying the requirement to collect local data to tailor local initiatives. This is important because as Kuh highlighted in his 2007 keynote to the Pacific Rim First Year in Higher Education Conference, while benchmarking between institutions is important, 'student engagement varies more within than between institutions' (Kuh, 2007, slide 19).

Second, should any lingering doubts have remained, this analysis establishes quite clearly that the Australasian FYE context, while broadly similar in certain respects to the North American experience and possibly closer to that of the UK, is very distinct in many ways. As identified early in this review's rationale, citing the observations of K. Walker (2001), McInnis (2001) and Darlston-Jones et al. (2001), our FYE culture, experience and practice are topics that demand independent investigation and are not capable of easy equation, without cultural re-interpretation, to the broader international experience. Australasian researchers and practitioners should be justly proud and confident of the significant contributions they have made to the international understanding of the FYE in higher education, particularly by reason of the fresh eyes they have brought to more than 40 years of research and commentary worldwide. The US college tradition of the first year seminar is a case in point. Free of the constraints of a long history of adherence to this approach in the Australasian FYE, the conceptual framework of a transition pedagogy has provided a theoretically-informed platform for best practice in contextualised support to enable our sectors' universities to embrace the scale of 'institutional and cultural transformation' that Hunter and Linder (2005, pp. 288–289) identified as desirable in 'a perfect [FYE] world'.

That many first-year seminars have been add-ons and loosely coupled to the curriculum also contributes to the fact that many seminars do not survive (Barefoot, 2000). ... In a perfect world where all first-year instruction included special attention to the individual needs of students, there would be no need for first-year seminars. However, in the absence of institutional and cultural transformation, campuses are likely to continue embracing first-year seminars for years to come.

Third, as has been observed elsewhere (Harvey et al., 2006), this review has served to reinforce, quite acutely over the course of the decade, that there is no one 'homogeneous [FYE] experience but a multiplicity of experiences contingent on type of institution and student characteristics ... Furthermore, the first year experience evolves and changes both temporally and culturally' (p. vii). The shifting target that is our students' 'multiplicity of experiences' requires that our research and practice be continuously refreshed and evaluated for relevance and enhancement; we should never be lulled into complacency that the first year has been 'attended to' and requires no further work. As more non-traditional students with greater diversity in backgrounds and preparedness are purposefully recruited via multiple pathways into Australasian higher education institutions, it is incumbent on us all to explore new and improved strategies and approaches to support increasingly heterogeneous cohorts' learning, success and retention. In this regard, for example, there are growing instances in the literature of what Zepke and his colleagues (Zepke et al., 2005) would call an 'emerging "adaptation" approach' (p. 3), whereby institutions *adapt* culture, processes and practices to support diversity, and thus effectively move beyond the more common and prevalent integration approach where they *adopt* [emphasis added] policies and practices to integrate students socially and academically into the institution's particular culture' (p. 5).

Many of these instances of sustainable adaptive approaches, which seek to support the widening participation agenda and its attendant diversity, can be seen in the discussions of coherent, intentional, supportive and inclusive first year curriculum design (Kift, 2009a). Moir (2010) suggests that 'it is possible that an inclusive rather than dichotomous approach of complementary rather than exclusive [integration and adaptation] categories is most effective' (p. 2). Consistent with this, Rivers (2005) calls for dual socialisation which is premised on an assumption that the two different institutional cultures can coexist.

The constancy of the imperative to be adaptive and flexible in agile response to the changing nature of increasingly disparate first year experiences is further exacerbated by the clear messages coming through the literature regarding the changing patterns of students' social activities and their learning engagement—on and off campus, off- and online, increasing hours in paid employment, and shifting hours spent on academic tasks. Indeed, so diverse is the FYE becoming, that some items in this review considered initial definitional matters arising out of the identification of *first year student* and *first year curriculum*. Overriding all of this disparity, however, is one unifying constant: students come to our institutions to learn and must be supported academically and socially in that learning experience.

Finally, it is clear from more than 40 years of research and commentary world-wide, of which the Australasian activity reported in this review forms part, that the development and implementation of sustainable FYE policy, practice and associated infrastructure is long-term work. As Swing warned in his keynote to the Pacific Rim First Year in Higher Education Conference in 2003, 'most 'excellent' [FYE] programs took 10 years or more to build' (Swing, 2003, slide 23). FYE programs that have gained the most traction and are having the greatest effect on improving first year student outcomes are those that have been enacted by partnerships between academic and professional staff adopting a whole-of-institution ethos. In this regard, broad-based, FYE-focused communities of practice provide an excellent vehicle, not only for staff development, but also for the cooperative development and evaluation of FYE resources and the opportunity to undertake substantial research projects. The factors are confirmed as key enablers by the principles espoused in the John N. Gardner Institute for Excellence in Undergraduate Education's Foundational Dimensions® (2005). However, as has also been identified, while crucial to the efficacy of contemporary FYE work, developing and maintaining sustainable partnerships between academic and professional staff is difficult work and 'all institutions are struggling with whole-of-institution integration, coordination and coherency' (Kift, 2009a, p. 2).

Where to from here?

Across a decade that has witnessed dynamic change—where communities, economies and workplaces, higher education providers amongst them, have all been required to evolve rapidly and (dis)continuously in response to common transformative influences such as globalisation, competitiveness, technology and changing societal, industrial and political realities—it is only right that research and practice around the FYE in Australasia has undergone its own evolution and progress towards maturation. As this review has demonstrated, continuing efforts to enhance the FYE of diverse commencing student cohorts may draw on an impressive body of research, practice and policy, both in our own region and further afield. But there remains 'much that we have not yet done to translate our research and theory into effective practice' (Tinto, 2006–2007, p. 2); while it might equally be said that we need to be constantly vigilant to ensure that all FYE practice is both grounded and works well in robust theory.

In 2011, there is much to be positive about regarding the status of the Australasian FYE. As Kift (2009a) has observed, 'There is considerable evidence of momentum for a sector-wide consensus around the FYE; for a "response that is unified and consistent" to "assist individual institutions and change agents open up discussions that lead to action" (Fellowship feedback, 2008)' (p. 3). Collected in these pages is a critical mass of FYE research and practice that is public, amenable to critical review and evaluation and in a form on which others in the FYE community can and should build (Shulman, 1998, p. 6).

Globally, the context is one of at least rhetorical, if not actual, commitment to widening access and participation, an increasing emphasis on teaching professionalism and renewed interest in student engagement and the quality of the student experience. For example, in the Australian context, despite the 2011 abolition of the ALTC, which has funded a large proportion of the research that is reported here, the Australian Government's response to the Bradley review, *Transforming Australia's higher education system* (DEEWR, 2009), articulates a strong vision for the Australian tertiary education sector and claims to 'support high quality teaching and learning, improve access and outcomes for students from low socio economic backgrounds, build new links between universities and disadvantaged schools, [and] reward institutions for meeting agreed quality and equity outcomes' (p. 5).

Extrinsic financial and reputational imperatives to improve student progression have recently bolstered FYE practitioners' intrinsic commitment to do the right thing by commencing student cohorts and provide equity of opportunity for all.

Whatever may be thought of the endemic array of government imposed regulatory devices in expressed attempts to maintain and improve educational standards—indicators to inform performance funding, institutional compacts, national surveys, participation and attainment targets, and regulatory and quality assurance frameworks—the student-centric focus of reform has been an important driver in institutional behaviour and one which can be leveraged for the first year student benefit.

So it is with renewed, if measured, optimism (again) that we look forward to the next great suite of first year opportunities and challenges. Some fertile ground for new and further research and investigation, hinted at in the discussion of the literature here presented—in addition to further investigation into, and identification of good practice examples of, the under-reported FYGPS of Assessment, Diversity, and Engagement and monitoring—include the following:

- Exploration of the FYE as foundational and critical for a satisfying and positive whole-of-program experience. As Tinto (2006–2007) has rightly pointed out, 'Engagement matters and it matters most during the critical first year of [university]' (p. 4). Students face multiple transitions as they proceed through their degree programs (for example, from first into second semester, from second into third semester/second year) and out into the world of work. What is the FYE's relationship to those other critical transition periods, as discussed, for example, in P. Taylor et al. (2007) and by Wells, Kift and Field (2008)? How might the FYE better support and enable these longer-term transitions? The work of Willcoxson (2010) across the three years of university study provides another interesting model for further investigation in this regard.
- As participation and attainment targets move the sector towards delivering the transformative effects of higher education to greater numbers and increasingly diverse entering cohorts, it would be beneficial for more studies to take a cross-institutional or whole-of-sector or inter-sectoral view of programs and initiatives designed to support student outcomes. Evidence of this type of work has started to appear (Brinkworth et al., 2009; Crisp et al. 2009; K. Nelson et al., 2009).
- As attention focuses on increasing connectivity with and articulation from alternate pathways into universities, real questions arise as to whether pathway students (for example, in dual sector institutions, from vocational education and training providers, from dedicated feeder programs), who are often accorded advanced standing or credit for prior study, are assured of a smooth pathway into university study in terms of the 'depth and detail of subject knowledge, pedagogical approach and assessment, and the level, genre and independent nature of academic research and writing' (Pearce, Murphy, & Conroy, 2000, cited in Pearce, 2009, para. 28). While bridging programs provide one solution, investigation into other possible approaches to support pathway students is urgently needed. For example, Pearce has suggested: alternative approaches to credit; incorporating elements of the first year curriculum in feeder or pathway programs; incorporating first year elements in later year higher education subjects; and a model of intentional, joint teaching and curriculum design across the two (vocational and higher education) sectors.
- Accepting the clear evidence that enacting a comprehensive, integrated, and coordinated whole-of-institution approach to the FYE is desirable, how might this be achieved? Possible areas of activity in this regard, as recommended by Kift's ALTC Fellowship (2009a), include research-based policy enactment to enable practice enhancements for diverse first year cohorts, and project work that is 'commissioned around facilitating, enabling and enacting academic and professional partnerships' (p. 3).
- In an era where benchmarking and quality assurance against established standards are becoming more commonplace, desirable consideration might be given to 'investigating and articulating sector-wide standards for the undergraduate [and postgraduate] FYE' (Kift, 2009a, p. 3). Some of this work is already underway in two current higher education research projects.²⁵

²⁵ *Good practice for safeguarding student learning engagement in higher education institutions* (ALTC Competitive Grant CG10-1730 2011-2012), and *Establishing a framework for transforming student engagement, success and retention in higher education institutions* (ALTC Innovation and Development Grant ID11-2056 2011-2013).

More specific foci and aspects of FYE practice that might productively be explored could include:

- Models for staff–student engagement and interactions in the context of fraught academic workloads, noting also that positive student interactions with support and other professional (for example, service area) staff are also vitally important.
- Inquiry-based learning in the first year, for example, as suggested by D. Wood (2010).
- Conceptualisations of work integrated learning in different disciplinary contexts that are appropriate and sustainable for the first year context, for example, as suggested by Winning et al. (2007) and D. Wood (2009).
- The FYE for students entering postgraduate coursework programs, noting that the entry of many of these students to such programs is based on professional standing.
- The higher degree research experience, noting that funding and reputational consequences have to some extent forced attention to the postgraduate research experience as is the case in the UK (Harvey et al., 2006, p. 137).
- The investigation of inclusive curriculum design for diverse cohorts. Work in the disability area might provide a useful template (see, for example, Payne, Kirkpatrick, Goodacre, & McLean, 2006).
- The potential for ePortfolio to support and enhance the FYE (Kift, 2009c). One of the practice-focused development projects investigated in the Scottish enhancement themes on the FYE was *Personal development planning in the first year* (K. Miller et al., 2008).
- The online engagement of diverse first year cohorts across the spectrum of institutional interactions (for example, online enrolment, websites, learning management systems, information provision). This area has not received the attention it deserves. How might our universities optimally deliver institutional eAdministration and eLearning for a holistic view of students' institutional engagement (K. Nelson et al., 2005)? See, for example, the work of Kennedy et al. (2008), Kennedy et al. (2009) and Krause and McEwen (2009).
- The applicability of social networking technologies to learning and teaching, student engagement, and the issues associated with their use, while maintaining a balance of the physical and virtual environment.
- What influences the park, churn and drift (discussed by Kift, 2007) through first year for those students who are retained? Students may 'park' themselves in a unit that is unsuitable, 'churn' their way through multiple iterations of enrolments, or just passively 'drift' through their enrolment not actively engaged. How might this experience be better normalised, managed and supported?
- How might students be more productively engaged and expectations mediated in the pre-orientation period—the period between (at least) letter of offer and orientation week?
- How might we manage more purposefully and relevantly co-curricular engagement, especially for time-poor students generally and equity groups specifically?
- How do we provide high challenge, high support environments for diverse cohorts, especially with an eye to assuring engagement for high achieving students? It is clear that first year students expect their university studies to be challenging, but the process and content of striking the balance between achievability and challenge (with concomitant support) is delicate work, particularly in the widening participation environment.
- How is program indecision for school leavers normalised and later mediated at the institutional door? Related to this, given that we know how critical program choice and career exploration are to first year satisfaction and retention, how are these supports best deployed across the FYE? Zepke et al. (2005) discuss academic advice on entry, while the industry of prospective student advising remains relatively under-explored (see James, Baldwin, & McInnis, 1999).
- What are the indicia of good first year teaching and support in environments where teaching standards have become part of the regulatory and funding framework?
- A dedicated exploration of models for quality staff development opportunities for both centrally located and faculty-based professional FYE staff. This focus could leverage off the growing interest in communities of practice models.
- How institutional reward and recognition structures for both academic and professional staff might be aligned with desirable FYE practice.

- Further research into the provision and impact of social learning spaces, given the growing recognition of their importance. For example, in the middle of the decade, Pillay et al. (2006) reported on the positive impact on student learning behaviours of purpose-built open plan formal and informal learning spaces on a new campus. The role of peers was paramount being ‘seen as more valuable than lecturers when it came to the development of understanding’ (p. 246). Later, Matthews et al. (2009) found that science students who used designated social learning spaces ‘demonstrated higher levels of engagement’ (p. 1) while K. Nelson (2009) described the effect of a dedicated space for first year students, ‘The Green Room’, on the learning of information technology students. ‘Ostensibly for the use of first years as a common room/social space, ... [The Green Room was] constantly occupied’ and evaluated by students as ‘the best thing about studying IT at [name of institution]’ (p. 9).
- Research into the provision of, and impact on, non-academic support services. AUSSE data reveal that supporting students to socialise and mainstreaming non-academic support service delivery are areas deserving of attention. Support for student health and wellbeing generally, and strategies to alleviate the psychological distress suffered by some cohorts of students (for example, law students as discussed in Field & Kift, 2010) have come to be emerging and important areas of first year concern.
- The residential college experience and its impact on the FYE. Little work has been done in Australasia in this area (for example, Australian Council for Educational Research, 2009; Muldoon & Macdonald, 2009).

This section has provided a considerable number of examples of possible future FYE-focused research and investigations into evidence-based practice that could be pursued. However, it should be noted that the list is indicative not exhaustive. Further, these suggestions are necessarily generic and need to be interpreted within the variety of specific contexts idiosyncratic to a variety of student cohorts, individual institutions, sectors and regions.

And finally ...

This review is testament to the fact that the study of the FYE is now well established in Australasia as a focus for research and evidence-based practice. Further, the FYE movement is *on the cusp* and ready for more sophisticated research such as inter-professional teams implementing institution-wide projects. While the Transition, Design and Engagement FYCPs are being addressed reasonably well, there is potential for activities applying the Diversity, Assessment, and Evaluation and monitoring principles. As useful as the generational classification has been to conceptualising FYE, there is a potentially richer alternative available in the Capability Maturity Model, which would facilitate studies both between institutions, within a sector and between sectors. These aspects provide the challenges and the opportunities for FYE adherents, both scholars and practitioners, to grapple with in the next decade.

Downloaded Copy



References

- Adam, A., Hartigan, C., & Brown, N. (2010). The value of an open, early academic development program to students' transition and first year experience: The UTAS UniStart program. *International Journal of the First Year in Higher Education*, 1(1), 43–54. doi: 10.5204/intjfyhe.v1i1.18
- Adams, P., Alcock, J., Bulmer, M., Grotowski, J., Hong, M-C., Jennings, N., ... Scharaschkin, V. (2008). *A new enabling technology for learning and teaching quantitative skills* [Final report]. Sydney, Australia: Australian Learning and Teaching Council. Retrieved from <http://www.fyhe.qut.edu.au/projects/altc/documents/mathsreportjuly08.pdf>
- Airini, Brown, D., Curtis, E., Johnson, O., Luatua, F., O'Shea, M., ... Ulugia-Pua, M. (2010). *Success for all: Improving Māori and Pasifika student success in degree-level studies*. Wellington, New Zealand: Teaching and Learning Research Initiative. Retrieved from http://www.tlri.org.nz/assets/A_Project-PDFs/9247-Airini/9247-Airini-final-report.pdf
- Ali, S., & Lockstone, L. (2006, December). *Tracking students to identify "at risk" attitudes and appropriate engagement practices*. Paper presented at the Australia and New Zealand Marketing Academy Annual Conference, 'Advancing Theory, Maintaining Relevance', Brisbane, Australia. Retrieved from http://pandora.nla.gov.au.ezp01.library.qut.edu.au/pan/25410/20070805-0006/smib.vuw.ac.nz_8081/WWW/ANZMAC2006/documents/Ali_Shameem2.pdf
- Allen, B., Crosky, A., McAlpine, I., Hoffman, M., & Munroe, P. (2006, December). *A blended approach to collaborative learning: Can it make large group teaching more student-centred?* Paper presented at the 23th ascilite Conference, 'Who's Learning? Whose Technology?', Sydney, Australia. Retrieved from http://www.ascilite.org.au/conferences/sydney06/proceeding/pdf_papers/p125.pdf
- ALTC—see Australian Learning and Teaching Council.
- Anderson, J., & McCrea, N. (2005). *Understanding attrition at UNE: A research report: Investigations of beginning students' reasons for withdrawing and not completing semester 1*. Armidale, Australia: University of New England.
- Andrews, C. (2006, July). *Early targeting of first year learning expectations*. Paper presented at the 9th Pacific Rim First Year in Higher Education Conference, 'Engaging Students', Gold Coast, Australia. Retrieved from http://www.fyhe.com.au/past_papers/2006/Papers/Andrews.pdf
- Arkoudis, S., Yu, X., Baik, C., Borland, H., Chang, S., Lang, I., ... Watty, K. (2010). *Finding common ground: Enhancing interaction between domestic and international students* [Final report]. Sydney, Australia: Australian Learning and Teaching Council. Retrieved from http://www.cshe.unimelb.edu.au/research/experience/docs/FindingCommonGround_web.pdf
- Armstrong, S., Campbell, M., & Brogan, M. (2009, June–July). *Interventions to enhance the student experience of a first year law degree: What they really wanted*. Paper presented at the 12th Pacific Rim First Year in Higher Education Conference, 'Preparing for Tomorrow Today: The First Year as Foundation', Townsville, Australia. Retrieved from http://www.fyhe.com.au/past_papers/papers09/content/pdf/11A.pdf
- Asmar, C., & Peseta, T. (2001, December). *'Figuring things out from my friends': Encouraging collaboration among first year students at undergraduate and postgraduate level*. Paper presented at the Australian Association for Research in Education Annual Conference, Melbourne, Australia. Retrieved from <http://www.aare.edu.au/01pap/asm01362.htm>
- Australasian Survey of Student Engagement. (2008). *Attracting, engaging and retaining: New conversations about learning: Australasian student engagement report*. Melbourne, Australia: Australian Council for Educational Research.
- Australasian Survey of Student Engagement. (2009). *Engaging students for success: Australasian student engagement report*. Melbourne, Australia: Australian Council for Educational Research.
- Australasian Survey of Student Engagement. (2010). *Doing more for learning: Enhancing engagement and outcomes: Australasian student engagement report*. Melbourne, Australia: Australian Council for Educational Research.

- Australian Council for Educational Research. (2008). Initial educational experiences of tertiary students. *LSAY Briefing*, 14, 1–8. Retrieved from http://www.acer.edu.au/documents/LSAY_BriefingReport14.pdf
- Australian Council for Educational Research. (2009). Engaging college communities: The impact of residential colleges in Australian higher education. *AUSSE Research Briefing*, 4. Retrieved from http://www.acer.edu.au/documents/AUSSE_BriefingVolume409.pdf
- Australian Government Department of Education, Employment and Workplace Relations (DEEWR). (2009). *Transforming Australia's higher education system*. Canberra, Australia: Author. Retrieved from http://www.deewr.gov.au/HigherEducation/Documents/PDF/Additional%20Report%20-%20Transforming%20Aus%20Higher%20ED_webaw.pdf
- Australian Government Department of Education, Science and Training. (2004). *Higher education attrition rates 1994–2002: A brief overview*. Canberra, Australia: Author.
- Australian Learning and Teaching Council (ALTC). (2008). *What's happening in assessment?* Sydney, Australia: Author. Available from <http://www.altc.edu.au/resources?text=What%E2%80%99s+happening+in+assessment%3F>
- Australian Learning and Teaching Council (ALTC). (2009a). Call for sector-wide FYE standards. *Communiqué*, 2, 42–44, 66. Retrieved from http://www.altc.edu.au/system/files/Communique_0909_Final.pdf
- Australian Learning and Teaching Council (ALTC). (2009b). Ensuring a successful transition to first year. *Communiqué*, 2, 14. Retrieved from http://www.altc.edu.au/system/files/Communique_0909_Final.pdf
- Australian Learning and Teaching Council (ALTC). (2010). *What's happening in assessment? 2009*. Sydney, Australia: Author. Available from <http://www.altc.edu.au/resources?text=What%E2%80%99s+happening+in+assessment%3F>
- Bagot, K., Lindley, J., Vance, S., Liddell, M., Davidson, S., Story, M., ... Lewenberg, M. (2004, July). *Cultural diversity in first year medicine – Where are the issues?* Paper presented at the 8th Pacific Rim First Year in Higher Education Conference, 'Dealing with Diversity', Melbourne, Australia. Available from http://www.fyhe.com.au/past_papers/papers04.htm
- Baker, K., Barrington, F., Gleeson, D., Livett, M., & McFadyen, D. (2002, July). *Development of a science transition program 2000–2002*. Paper presented at the 6th Pacific Rim First Year in Higher Education Conference, 'Changing Agendas "Te Ao Hurihuri"', Christchurch, New Zealand. Available from http://www.fyhe.com.au/past_papers/papers02.htm
- Ballantyne, C. (2000, February). *Are they glad they came? First year students' views of their university experience*. Paper presented at the 9th annual Teaching and Learning Forum, 'Flexible Futures in Tertiary Teaching', Perth, Australia. Retrieved from <http://otl.curtin.edu.au/tlf/tlf2000/ballantyne.html>
- Ballantyne, J., Todd, N., & Olm, T. (2007, July). *The first year experience: Perceptions of students at a new campus*. Paper presented at the 30th HERDSA Annual Conference, 'Enhancing Higher Education, Theory and Scholarship', Adelaide, Australia. Retrieved from <http://www.herdsa.org.au/wp-content/uploads/conference/2007/papers/p193.pdf>
- Bambrick, S. (2002, July). *The satellite/remote campus: A quality experience for Australian first year students?* Paper presented at the 6th Pacific Rim First Year in Higher Education Conference, 'Changing Agendas "Te Ao Hurihuri"', Christchurch, New Zealand. Available from http://www.fyhe.com.au/past_papers/papers02.htm
- Bamforth, C. (2010, July). *Improving undergraduates' performance via an embedded generic skills program*. Paper presented at the 33rd HERDSA Annual Conference, 'Reshaping Higher Education', Melbourne, Australia. Retrieved from http://www.herdsa.org.au/wp-content/uploads/conference/2010/papers/HERDSA2010_Bamforth_C.pdf
- Barker, G. (2000, July). *First year students' perceptions of writing difficulties in science: "I didn't expect it to be so different to school"*. Paper presented at the 4th Pacific Rim First Year in Higher Education Conference, 'Creating Futures for a New Millennium', Brisbane, Australia. Available from http://www.fyhe.com.au/past_papers/abstracts/BarkerAbstract.htm
- Bath, D., & Bourke, J. (2010, June). *"The Learning Couch": An online self-directed tool for supporting students' development of effective approaches to learning*. Paper presented at the 13th Pacific Rim First Year in Higher Education Conference, 'Aspiration, Access, Achievement', Adelaide, Australia. Retrieved from http://www.fyhe.com.au/past_papers/papers10/content/pdf/11C.pdf

- Bellette, M. (2005). How are student approaches to learning navigation correlated with their assessment outcomes? *Australian Journal of Outdoor Education*, 9(2), 31–43.
- Benckendorff, P. (2009, June–July). *Using wikis to help first year students develop collaborative knowledge management skills for tomorrow*. Paper presented at the 12th Pacific Rim First Year in Higher Education Conference, 'Preparing for Tomorrow Today: The First Year as Foundation', Townsville, Australia. Retrieved from http://www.fyhe.com.au/past_papers/papers09/content/pdf/12C.pdf
- Benseman, J., Coxon, E., Anderson, H., & Anae, M. (2006). Retaining non-traditional students: Lessons learnt from Pasifika students in New Zealand. *Higher Education Research & Development*, 25(2), 147–162. doi: 10.1080/07294360600610388
- Biggs, J. (1987). *Student approaches to learning and studying*. Melbourne, Australia: Australian Council for Educational Research.
- Birch, E., & Miller, P. (2006). Student outcomes at university in Australia: A quantile regression approach. *Australian Economic Papers*, 45(1), 1–17. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-8454.2006.00274.x
- Bird, F. (2006, September). *Rethinking practical assessment in first year biology*. Paper presented at the Symposium on Assessment in Science Teaching and Learning, Sydney, Australia. Retrieved from <http://science.uniserve.edu.au/pubs/procs/2006/bird.pdf>
- Blanksby, T., & Chan, C. (2006, September). *Feedback assessment of science report writing for first year genetics students*. Paper presented at the Symposium on Assessment in Science Teaching and Learning, Sydney, Australia. Retrieved from <http://science.uniserve.edu.au/pubs/procs/2006/blanksby.pdf>
- Blunden, R. (2002). First year student attrition and the moral responsibility of universities. *Journal of Institutional Research*, 11(1), 59–70. Available from <http://www.aair.org.au/journal/volume-11-no-1>
- Bolitho, R. (2001, December). *The interactional effects of personality type, student learning styles and initial degree choice on first year university students' anxiety and career decision certainty: A model of influence*. Paper presented at the Australian Association for Research in Education Annual Conference, Melbourne, Australia. Retrieved from <http://www.aare.edu.au/01pap/bol01201.htm>
- Bonanno, H. (2002, July). *Standing the test of time: Revisiting a first year diagnostic procedure*. Paper presented at the 6th Pacific Rim First Year in Higher Education Conference, 'Changing Agendas "Te Ao Hurihuri"', Christchurch, New Zealand. Available from http://www.fyhe.com.au/past_papers/papers02.htm
- Boyd, J., & Lintern, S. (2006, July). *From "LOST" to engaging in uni life: How a pilot student mentoring program is assisting first year students*. Paper presented at the 9th Pacific Rim First Year in Higher Education Conference, 'Engaging Students', Gold Coast, Australia. Retrieved from http://www.fyhe.com.au/past_papers/2006/Papers/Boyd.pdf
- Boyd, W., O'Reilly, M., Bucher, D., Fisher, K., Morton, A., Harrison, P., ... Rendall, K. (2010). Activating the teaching-research nexus in smaller universities: Case studies highlighting diversity of practice. *Journal of University Teaching & Learning Practice*, 7(2). Available from <http://ro.uow.edu.au/jutlp/vol7/iss2/9>
- Brack, C., & Van Damme, M-P. (2010, December). *The wiki factor: Scaffolding online learning in groups*. Paper presented at the 27th ascilite Conference, 'Curriculum, Technology and Transformation for an Unknown Future', Sydney, Australia. Retrieved from <http://ascilite.org.au/conferences/sydney10/procs/Brack-concise.pdf>
- Bradley, D., Noonan, P., Nugent, H., & Scales, B. (2008). *Review of Australian higher education* [Final report]. Canberra, Australia: Commonwealth of Australia. Available from <http://www.deewr.gov.au/highereducation/review/pages/reviewofaustralianhighereducationreport.aspx>
- Brett, M., & Kavanagh, L. (2007, July). *Are a few veggie burgers enough?* Paper presented at the 10th Pacific Rim First Year in Higher Education Conference, 'Engage, Regenerate, Experiment', Brisbane, Australia. Retrieved from http://www.fyhe.com.au/past_papers/papers07/final_papers/pdfs/5e.pdf
- Bridges, W. (2003). *Managing transitions* (2nd ed.). Cambridge, MA: Perseus Publishing Co.
- Brinkworth, R., McCann, B., Matthews, C., & Nordström, K. (2009). First year expectations and experiences: Student and teacher perspectives. *Higher Education*, 58(2), 157–173. doi: 10.1007/s10734-008-9188-3
- Britton, S., New, P., Sharma, M., & Yardley, D. (2005). A case study of the transfer of mathematics skills by university students. *International Journal of Mathematical Education in Science and Technology*, 36(1), 1–13. doi: 10.1080/00207390412331271401

- Bronfenbrenner, U. (1976). The experimental ecology of education. *Educational Researcher*, 5(9), 5–15. doi: 10.3102/0013189X005009005
- Brown, N., & Adam, A. (2009, July). *Towards a model first year experience: A staff perspective*. Paper presented at the 32nd HERDSA Annual Conference, 'The Student Experience', Darwin, Australia. Retrieved from http://www.herdsa.org.au/wp-content/uploads/conference/2009/papers/HERDSA2009_Brown_N.pdf
- Brown, N., Adam, A., Douglas, R., & Skalicky, J. (2009, June–July). *Why do they come? A review of individual student learning appointments*. Paper presented at the 12th Pacific Rim First Year in Higher Education Conference, 'Preparing for Tomorrow Today: The First Year as Foundation', Townsville, Australia. Retrieved from http://www.fyhe.com.au/past_papers/papers09/content/pdf/6B.pdf
- Brownlee, J., Walker, S., Lennox, S., Exley, B., & Pearce, S. (2009). The first year university experience: Using personal epistemology to understand effective learning and teaching in higher education. *Higher Education*, 58(5), 599–628. doi: 10.1007/s10734-009-9212-2
- Budge, K. (2010, July). *The diversification of Australian higher education: Is the academy prepared for the challenge?* Paper presented at the 33rd HERDSA Annual Conference, 'Reshaping Higher Education', Melbourne, Australia. Retrieved from http://www.herdsa.org.au/wp-content/uploads/conference/2010/papers/HERDSA2010_Budge_K.pdf
- Buissink-Smith, N., Spronken-Smith, R., & Walker, R. (2010). You're doing what? Students' experiences of advice from a New Zealand university. *Higher Education Research & Development*, 29(4), 357–371. doi: 10.1080/07294361003601891
- Bull, D. (2000). Access and retention programs for tertiary students: New directions. *New Horizons in Education*, 102, 77–83.
- Burke da Silva, K., & Auburn, Z. (2009, June–July). *The development of a structured "Peer Assisted Study Program" with required attendance*. Paper presented at the 12th Pacific Rim First Year in Higher Education Conference, 'Preparing for Tomorrow Today: The First Year as Foundation', Townsville, Australia. Retrieved from http://www.fyhe.com.au/past_papers/papers09/content/pdf/9D.pdf
- Burnett, L., & Larmar, S. (2008, June). *Improving the first year: The role of First Year Advisors (FYA)*. Paper presented at the 21st International Conference on the First Year Experience, Dublin, Ireland. Retrieved from http://www.sc.edu/fye/events/presentation/international/2008/INT_2008_Summaries.pdf
- Burton, K., & Cuffe, N. (2005). The design and implementation of criterion-referenced assessment in a first-year undergraduate core law unit. *Legal Education Review*, 15(1), 159–175. Available from http://www.ler.edu.au/pdf/volumes/ler_vol15_1and2_2005.pdf
- Burton, L., Taylor, J., Dowling, D., & Lawrence, J. (2009). Learning approaches, personality and concepts of knowledge of first-year students: Mature-age versus school leaver. *Studies in Learning, Evaluation, Innovation and Development*, 6(1), 65–81.
- Calder, A. (2000, July). *Online Learning Support: An action research project*. Paper presented at the 4th Pacific Rim First Year in Higher Education Conference, 'Creating Futures for a New Millennium', Brisbane, Australia. Available from http://www.fyhe.com.au/past_papers/abstracts/CalderAbstract.htm
- Calder, A. (2004). Peer interaction in the transition process. *Journal of the Australian and New Zealand Student Services Association*, 23, 4–16. Available from <http://www.adcet.edu.au/anzssa/View.aspx?id=7436>
- Cameron, H., & Tesoriero, F. (2003, July). *First year at uni*. Paper presented at the 7th Pacific Rim First Year in Higher Education Conference, 'Enhancing the Transition to Higher Education', Brisbane, Australia. Available from http://www.fyhe.com.au/past_papers/papers03.htm
- Cameron, H., & Tesoriero, F. (2004, July). *Adjusting institutional practices to support diverse student groups*. Paper presented at the 8th Pacific Rim First Year in Higher Education Conference, 'Dealing with Diversity', Melbourne, Australia. Available from http://www.fyhe.com.au/past_papers/papers04.htm
- Carlson, G., Scarbrough, J., & Carlson, J. (2009). Holistic intervention program for at-risk students. In D. Nutt & D. Calderon (Eds.), *International perspectives on the first year experience in higher education* (pp. 67–73). Columbia, NC: University of South Carolina.
- Carmichael, E. (2003, November). *Evaluating evaluations: A case study in peer mentoring*. Paper presented at the Biennial Language and Academic Skills in Higher Education Conference, 'In the Future', Adelaide, Australia. Retrieved from <http://www.aall.org.au/sites/default/files/LAS2003%20BIANNUAL%20CONFERENCE.pdf>

- Carr, R., Hagel, P., & Hellier, P. (2010, July). *Measuring student engagement: Using "flow" theory to guide question development*. Paper presented at the 33rd HERDSA Annual Conference, 'Reshaping higher education', Melbourne, Australia. Retrieved from http://www.herdsa.org.au/wp-content/uploads/conference/2010/papers/HERDSA2010_Carr_R.pdf
- Chu, H., Treagust, D., & Chandrasegaran, A. (2008). Naïve students' conceptual development and beliefs: The need for multiple analyses to determine what contributes to student success in a university introductory physics course. *Research in Science Education*, 38(1), 111–125. doi: 10.1007/s11165-007-9068-3
- Clark, J. (2009). What use is SoTL? Using the scholarship of teaching and learning to develop a curriculum for first year university history classes. *Journal of University Teaching & Learning Practice*, 6(2). Available from <http://ro.uow.edu.au/jutlp/vol6/iss2/3>
- Clark, W. (2009). *Commentary on first year curriculum case studies: Peer-to-peer interaction perspective*. Paper presented at the FYE Curriculum Design Symposium, 'Articulating a Transition Pedagogy', Brisbane, Australia. Available from <http://www.fyhe.qut.edu.au/transitionpedagogy/expertcomment/peertopeer.jsp>
- Clerahan, R. (2002). Transition to tertiary education in the arts and humanities. Some academic initiatives from Australia. *Arts and Humanities in Higher Education*, 2(1), 72–89. doi: 10.1177/1474022203002001007
- Clerahan, R., & Walker, I. (2003, November). *Student perceptions of preparedness for first-year university assignment writing: The discipline of marketing*. Paper presented at the Biennial Language and Academic Skills in Higher Education Conference, 'In the Future', Adelaide, Australia. Retrieved from <http://www.aall.org.au/sites/default/files/LAS2003%20BIANNUAL%20CONFERENCE.pdf>
- Clulow, V. (2000). "Is it supplemental instruction" or just good teaching? An analysis of a peer tutoring experience in a first-year business subject. *Journal of Institutional Research*, 9(1), 89–99. Available from <http://www.air.org.au/journal/volume-9-no-1>
- Coffee, J. (2007). Using an online audio visual aid to facilitate the teaching and learning of clinical reasoning. *Focus on Health Professional Education*, 9(3), 89–91.
- Corbin, J., & Karasmanis, S. (2010, June). *Evidence into practice: Evaluation of an innovative information literacy model for first year Health Sciences students*. Paper presented at the 13th Pacific Rim First Year in Higher Education Conference, 'Aspiration, Access, Achievement', Adelaide, Australia. Retrieved from http://www.fyhe.com.au/past_papers/papers10/content/pdf/2A.pdf
- Crisp, G., Palmer, E., Turnbull, D., Nettelbeck, T., Ward, L., LeCouteur, A., ... Schneider, L. (2009). First year student expectations: Results from a university-wide student survey. *Journal of University Teaching & Learning Practice*, 6(1). Available from <http://ro.uow.edu.au/jutlp/vol6/iss1/3>
- Crosling, G. (2003). Connecting new students: A faculty academic transition programme. *Widening Participation and Lifelong Learning*, 5(1), 40–42. doi: 10.1080/03098771003695494
- Crosling, G., Heagney, M., & Thomas, L. (2009). Improving student retention in higher education: Improving teaching and learning. *Australian Universities' Review*, 51(2), 9–18. Available from <http://www.aur.org.au/archive/2000s>
- Crosthwaite, C., & Churchward, G. (2000). Reflections on a residential orientation program. *Australasian Journal of Engineering Education*, 9(1), 39–45. Available from http://www.aee.com.au/journal/AJEEv9n1_2000.pdf
- Crowther, P. (2010, November). *Assessing architectural design processes of diverse learners*. Paper presented at the ATN Assessment Conference, 'Assessment: Sustainability, Diversity and Innovation', Sydney, Australia. Retrieved from <http://www.iml.uts.edu.au/pdfs/Crowther.pdf>
- Cullen, M. (2006, April). *Ensuring quality and relevance — future directions for funding tertiary organisations. Speech to stakeholders* [Speech notes]. Retrieved from <http://www.tec.govt.nz/Documents/Reports%20and%20other%20documents/tertiary-reforms-education-changes-and-consultation-4%20April%202006.pdf>
- Cullen, M. (2007, May 10). *Driving higher quality university education* [New Zealand Government media statement]. Retrieved from <http://www.tec.govt.nz/Documents/Reports%20and%20other%20documents/ministers-media-release-10-May-2007.pdf>
- Curtis, B., Hefley, W., & Miller, S. (2009). *The People Capability Maturity Model (P-CMM). Version 2.0* (2nd ed.). Software Engineering Institute: Carnegie-Mellon University.

- Dancer, D., & Fiebig, D. (2000, July). *Modelling students at risk*. Paper presented at the 4th Pacific Rim First Year in Higher Education Conference, 'Creating Futures for a New Millennium', Brisbane, Australia. Available from http://www.fyhe.com.au/past_papers/papers00.htm
- Dancer, D., & Kamvounias, P. (2008, June–July). *Predicting success in a first-year unit of study*. Paper presented at the 11th Pacific Rim First Year in Higher Education Conference, 'An Apple for the Learner: Celebrating the First Year Experience', Hobart, Australia. Available from http://www.fyhe.com.au/past_papers/papers08/FYHE2008/index.html
- Dane, J. (2010, July). *Teaching in student-centred learning environments*. Paper presented at the 33rd HERDSA Annual Conference, 'Reshaping Higher Education', Melbourne, Australia. Retrieved from http://www.herdsa.org.au/wp-content/uploads/conference/2010/papers/HERDSA2010_Dane_J.pdf
- Darab, S. (2006, December). *Assessing the communications and take-up of academic values, codes and conventions: An empirical study of a first-year unit for undergraduates*. Paper presented at the 2nd Asia-Pacific Educational Integrity Conference, 'Educational Integrity: Values in Teaching, Learning and Research', Newcastle, Australia. Retrieved from http://www.newcastle.edu.au/conference/apeic/papers_pdf/darab_0549_edd.pdf
- Darlaston-Jones, D., Cohen, L., Drew, N., Haunold, S., Pike, L., & Young, A. (2001, February). *Addressing attrition: Why we need a unified approach to transition issues*. Paper presented at the 10th annual Teaching and Learning Forum, 'Expanding Horizons in Teaching and Learning', Perth, Australia. Retrieved from <http://lsn.curtin.edu.au/tlf/tlf2001/darlaston-jones.html>
- Darlaston-Jones, D., Cohen, L., Haunold, S., Pike, L., Young, A., & Drew, N. (2003). The retention and persistence support (RAPS) project: A transition initiative. *Issues in Educational Research*, 13(2), 1–12. Retrieved from <http://www.iier.org.au/iier13/darlaston-jones2.html>
- Darroch, A., & Rainsbury, E. (2009, July). *When perception meets reality: Helping students understand their need for learning support in a first-year accountancy course*. Paper presented at the 32nd HERDSA Annual Conference, 'The Student Experience', Darwin, Australia. Retrieved from http://www.herdsa.org.au/wp-content/uploads/conference/2009/papers/HERDSA2009_Darroch_A.pdf
- Dawson, P., Lockyer, L., & Ferry, B. (2007, July). *Supporting first year student supporters: An online mentoring model for supplemental instruction leaders*. Paper presented at the 10th Pacific Rim First Year in Higher Education Conference, 'Engage, Regenerate, Experiment', Brisbane, Australia. Retrieved from http://www.fyhe.qut.edu.au/past_papers/papers07/final_papers/pdfs/7e.pdf
- De Clercq, L., Pearson, S., & Rolfe, I. (2001). The relationship between previous tertiary education and course performance in first year medical students at Newcastle University, Australia. *Education for Health*, 14(3), 417–426. doi: 10.1080/13576280110081764
- DEEWR—see Australian Government Department of Education, Employment and Workplace Relations.
- Devlin, M. (2008). Taking equity to a higher level. *Campus Review*, 18(30), 7.
- Devlin, M. (2009, February). *Socioeconomic status and Indigenous background: Implications for first year university curriculum*. Keynote address presented at the FYE Curriculum Design Symposium, 'Articulating a Transition Pedagogy', Brisbane, Australia. Retrieved from http://www.fyecd2009.qut.edu.au/resources/Marcia_Devlin.jsp#abstract
- Devlin, M. (2010, June). *Non-traditional university student achievement: Theory, policy and practice in Australia*. Keynote address presented at the 13th Pacific Rim First Year in Higher Education Conference, 'Aspiration, Access, Achievement', Adelaide, Australia. Retrieved from http://www.fyhe.com.au/past_papers/papers10/content/html/keynote.html
- Di Corpo, S. (2009, June–July). *Foundations: Supporting first year medical students @ UNSW*. Paper presented at the 12th Pacific Rim First Year in Higher Education Conference, 'Preparing for Tomorrow Today: The First Year as Foundation', Townsville, Australia. Retrieved from http://www.fyhe.com.au/past_papers/papers09/content/pdf/7C.pdf
- Dobozy, E., & Pospisil, R. (2008, November–December). "Just-in-time" virtual assignment help: A case study of first year teacher education students. Paper presented at the 25th ascilite Conference, "Hello! Where are You in the Landscape of Educational Technology?", Melbourne, Australia. Retrieved from <http://www.ascilite.org.au/conferences/melbourne08/procs/dobozy.pdf>
- Donnison, S., Edwards, D., Itter, D., Martin, D., & Yager, Z. (2009). Reflecting on improving our practice: Using collaboration as an approach to enhance first year transition in higher education. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education*, 34(3), 18–29. Available from <http://ro.ecu.edu.au/ajte/vol34/iss3/2>

- Donnison, S., & Masters, J. (2010, June). *Supporting transition into higher education through social affordances: The Pod experience*. Paper presented at the 13th Pacific Rim First Year in Higher Education Conference, 'Aspiration, Access, Achievement', Adelaide, Australia. Retrieved from http://www.fyhe.com.au/past_papers/papers10/content/pdf/14A.pdf
- Doring, A., Bingham, B., & Bramwell-Vial, A. (2001, July). *Commencing students' beliefs about success at university*. Paper presented at the 24th HERDSA Annual Conference, 'Learning Partnerships', Canberra, Australia. Retrieved from http://www.herdsa.org.au/newsite/wp-content/uploads/conference/2001/Papers/Doring_Bingham.pdf
- Douglass, L., & Islam, M. (2009, June–July). *Emotional wellbeing of first year university students: Critical for determining future academic success*. Paper presented at the 12th Pacific Rim First Year in Higher Education Conference, 'Preparing for Tomorrow Today: The First Year as Foundation', Townsville, Australia. Retrieved from http://www.fyhe.com.au/past_papers/papers09/content/pdf/8A.pdf
- Duff, A., Quinn, D., Johnston, H., & Lock, P. (2007, July). *A clue, a quest and a blog: Experimenting with engagement in orientation*. Paper presented at the 10th Pacific Rim First Year in Higher Education Conference, 'Engage, Regenerate, Experiment', Brisbane, Australia. Retrieved from http://www.fyhe.qut.edu.au/past_papers/papers07/final_papers/pdfs/1b.pdf
- Duncan, M., Quinn, C., Nelson, K., Smith, J., Creagh, T., & Clarke, J. (2009, June–July). *Operationalising first year curriculum principles*. A Nuts & Bolts presentation at the 12th Pacific Rim First Year in Higher Education Conference, 'Preparing for Tomorrow Today: The First Year as Foundation', Townsville, Australia. Retrieved from http://www.fyhe.com.au/past_papers/papers09/content/pdf/6C.pdf
- Edwards, A. (2010, November). *Evaluation of the implementation of criterion-referenced assessment in a school of zoology*. Paper presented at the ATN Assessment Conference, 'Assessment: Sustainability, Diversity and Innovation', Sydney, Australia. Retrieved from <http://www.iml.uts.edu.au/pdfs/edwards.pdf>
- Eijkman, H. (2002, July). *Reframing the first year experience: The critical role of 'recognition work' in achieving curricular justice*. Paper presented at the 6th Pacific Rim First Year in Higher Education Conference, 'Changing Agendas "Te Ao Hurihuri"', Christchurch, New Zealand. Available from http://www.fyhe.com.au/past_papers/papers02.htm
- Elder, C., Erlam, R., & von Randow, J. (2002, July). *Enhancing chances of academic success amongst first year undergraduates from diverse language backgrounds*. Paper presented at the 6th Pacific Rim First Year in Higher Education Conference, 'Changing Agendas "Te Ao Hurihuri"', Christchurch, New Zealand. Available from http://www.fyhe.com.au/past_papers/papers02.htm
- Elliott, A. (2002, July). *Factors affecting first year students' decisions to leave university*. Paper presented at the 6th Pacific Rim First Year in Higher Education Conference, 'Changing Agendas "Te Ao Hurihuri"', Christchurch, New Zealand. Available from http://www.fyhe.com.au/past_papers/papers02.htm
- Elliot, J. (2000). A report on the Thirteenth International Conference on the First Year Experience: Impressions and reactions. *Journal of the Australian and New Zealand Student Services Association*, 16, 75–80. Available from <http://www.adcet.edu.au/anzssa/View.aspx?id=7419>
- Ellis, J., & Salisbury, F. (2004). Information literacy milestones: Building upon the prior knowledge of first-year students. *Australian Library Journal*, 53(4), 383–396. Retrieved from http://alia.org.au/publishing/alj/53.4/alj.Vol_53_No_04_2004.pdf
- Ellis, N. (2010, January). *A place-identity mediated model of homesickness in first year university students experiencing a rural-to-urban relocation*. Paper presented at the 19th annual Teaching and Learning Forum, 'Educating for Sustainability', Perth, Australia. Retrieved from <http://otl.curtin.edu.au/tlf/tlf2010/abstracts.html#ellis>
- Ellis, R., Taylor, C., & Drury, H. (2007). Learning science through writing: Associations with prior conceptions of writing and perceptions of a writing program. *Higher Education Research & Development*, 26(3), 297–311. doi: 10.1080/07294360701494310
- Emerson, L., MacKay, B., & Rees, M. (2006, December). *Plagiarism in the science classroom: Misunderstandings and models*. Paper presented at the 2nd Asia-Pacific Educational Integrity Conference, 'Educational Integrity: Values in Teaching, Learning and Research', Newcastle, Australia. Retrieved from <http://www.newcastle.edu.au/conference/apeic/booklet/APEIC05proceeding.pdf>

- Emmitt, M., Callaghan, V., Warren, W., & Postill, K. (2002, July). *First year: The Deakin way*. Paper presented at the 6th Pacific Rim First Year in Higher Education Conference, 'Changing Agendas "Te Ao Hurihuri"', Christchurch, New Zealand. Available from http://www.fyhe.com.au/past_papers/papers02.htm
- Exeter, D., Ameratunga, S., Ratima, M., Morton, S., Dickson, M., Hsu, D., & Jackson, R. (2010). Student engagement in very large classes: The teachers' perspective. *Studies in Higher Education*, 35(7), 761–775. doi: 10.1080/03075070903545058
- Farrington, S., Page, S., & DiGregorio, K. (2001). The things that matter: Understanding the factors that affect the participation and retention of Indigenous students in the Cadigal program at the Faculty of Health Sciences, University of Sydney. *Journal of the Australian and New Zealand Student Services Association*, 18, 40–55. Available from <http://www.adcet.edu.au/anzssa/View.aspx?id=7418>
- Field, R., & Kift, S. (2010). Addressing the high levels of psychological distress in law students through intentional assessment and feedback design in the first year law curriculum. *International Journal of the First Year in Higher Education*, 1(1), 65–76. doi: 10.5204/intjfyhe.v1i1.20
- Fisher, R., McPhail, R., & McConachie, J. (2009, June–July). *Assisting transition through an Honours College program: An Australian perspective*. Paper presented at the 12th Pacific Rim First Year in Higher Education Conference, 'Preparing for Tomorrow Today: The First Year as Foundation', Townsville, Australia. Retrieved from http://www.fyhe.com.au/past_papers/papers09/content/pdf/10A.pdf
- Forret, M., Eames, C., Coll, R., Campbell, A., Cronje, T., Stewart, K., ... Prinsep, M. (2007). *Understanding and enhancing learning communities in tertiary education in science and engineering* [Final report]. Wellington, New Zealand: Teaching and Learning Research Initiative. Retrieved from http://www.tlri.org.nz/assets/A_Project-PDFs/9223_finalreport.pdf
- Foster, G. (2010). Teacher effects on student attrition and performance in mass-market tertiary education. *Higher Education*, 60(3), 301–319. doi: 10.1007/s10734-009-9301-2
- Fowler, J. (2004). The Tiered Mentoring Program: Linking students with peers and professionals. *HERDSA News*, 26(1), 18–19.
- Gale, T. (2009, June–July). *Towards a southern theory of higher education*. Keynote address presented at the 12th Pacific Rim First Year in Higher Education Conference, 'Preparing for Tomorrow Today: The First Year Experience as Foundation', Townsville, Australia. Retrieved from http://www.fyhe.com.au/past_papers/papers09/ppts/Trevor_Gale_paper.pdf
- Gale, T., & Tranter, D. (2011). Social justice in Australian higher education policy: An historical and conceptual account of student participation. *Critical Studies in Education*, 52(1), 29–46. doi: 10.1080/17508487.2011.536511
- Game, A., & Metcalfe, A. (2009). Dialogue and team teaching. *Higher Education Research & Development*, 28(1), 45–57. doi: 10.1080/07294360802444354
- Gibson-van Marrewijk, K., Hipkins, R., Stewart, J., Dannenfeldt, G., Stewart, K., & McHaffie, J. (2008). *Addressing obstacles to success: Improving student completion, retention, and achievement in science modules in applied-health programmes* [Final report]. Wellington, New Zealand: Teaching and Learning Research Initiative. Retrieved from http://www.tlri.org.nz/assets/A_Project-PDFs/9236_finalreport.pdf
- Glaser, N., Hall, R., & Halperin, S. (2006). Students supporting students: The effects of peer mentoring on the experiences of first year university students. *Journal of the Australian and New Zealand Student Services Association*, 27, 4–19. Available from <http://www.adcet.edu.au/anzssa/View.aspx?id=7434>
- Godfrey, E. (2008, December). *Sustainability of peer mentoring and peer tutoring initiatives to increase student engagement and reduce attrition*. Paper presented at the 19th annual Australasian Association for Engineering Education Conference, 'To Industry and Beyond', Yeppoon, Australia. Retrieved from http://aaee.com.au/conferences/papers/2008/aaee08_submission_M1B1.pdf
- Griffin, T., Gilchrist, A., & Thomson, R. (2009, December). *Role of the online tutor in a large enrolment unit*. Paper presented at the 26th ascilite Conference, 'Same Places, Different Spaces', Auckland, New Zealand. Retrieved from <http://www.ascilite.org.au/conferences/auckland09/procs/griffin.pdf>
- Griffin, T., & Thomson, R. (2008, November–December). *Evolution of blended learning in a large enrolment subject: What was blended and why?* Paper presented at the 25th ascilite Conference, 'Hello! Where are You in the Landscape of Educational Technology?', Melbourne, Australia. Retrieved from <http://www.ascilite.org.au/conferences/melbourne08/procs/griffin.pdf>

- Grob, G. (2000, July). *Surviving first year in higher education*. Paper presented at the 4th Pacific Rim First Year in Higher Education Conference, 'Creating Futures for a New Millennium', Brisbane, Australia. Available from http://www.fyhe.com.au/past_papers/papers00.htm
- Groen, L., & Carmody, G. (2005, September). *Blended learning in a first year mathematics subject*. Paper presented at the Symposium on Blended Learning in Science Teaching and Learning, Sydney, Australia. Retrieved from http://sydney.edu.au/science/uniserve_science/pubs/procs/wshop10/2005Groen.pdf
- Gross, J., & Dobozy, E. (2009, December). *Adding value to first year student learning with embedded library pod/vodcasts*. Paper presented at the 26th ascilite Conference, 'Same Places, Different Spaces', Auckland, New Zealand. Retrieved from <http://www.ascilite.org.au/conferences/auckland09/procs/gross.pdf>
- Hamlett, B. (2010, January). *Supporting pre-service primary teachers to improve their mathematics content knowledge*. Paper presented at the 19th annual Teaching and Learning Forum, 'Educating for Sustainability', Perth, Australia. Available from <http://otl.curtin.edu.au/tlf/tlf2010/abstracts.html#hamlett>
- Harvey, L., Drew, S., & Smith, M. (2006). *The first year experience: A literature review for the Higher Education Academy*. Sheffield, United Kingdom: Higher Education Academy. Retrieved from http://www.heacademy.ac.uk/projects/detail/litreview/lr_2006_harvey
- Hatsidimitris, G., & Wolfe, J. (2007). *Physclips: Multi-level, multi-media resources for teaching first year university physics* [Final report]. Sydney, Australia: Carrick Institute for Learning and Teaching in Higher Education. Retrieved from <http://www.altc.edu.au/resources?text=physclips>
- Henderson, R., Noble, K., & De George-Walker, L. (2009). Transitioning into university: 'Interrupted' first year students problem-solving their way into study. *Studies in Learning, Evaluation, Innovation and Development*, 6(1), 51–64.
- Higher Education Academy. (2001). *Strategies for widening participation in higher education: A guide to good practice* (Guide 01/36). York, United Kingdom: Author. Available from http://www.hefce.ac.uk/pubs/hefce/2001/01_36.htm
- Hillman, K., & McMillan, J. (2005). Transition to further education: The first-year experience. *Professional Educator*, 4(3), 6–9.
- Holden, H. (2005). A qualitative study of persistence and performance: Factors in the motivation of first year tertiary education students. *Education in Rural Australia*, 15(1), 28–40.
- Horstmanshof, L., & Zimitat, C. (2003a, July). *Do extracurricular roles impact on retention? A social exchange theory perspective*. Paper presented at the 7th Pacific Rim First Year in Higher Education Conference, 'Enhancing the Transition to Higher Education', Brisbane, Australia. Available from http://www.fyhe.com.au/past_papers/papers03.htm
- Horstmanshof, L., & Zimitat, C. (2003b, December). *Elaboration of the student self and persistence in higher education*. Paper presented at the Australian Association for Research in Education Annual Conference, Brisbane, Australia. Retrieved from <http://www.aare.edu.au/03pap/hor03112.pdf>
- Howells, K. (2003, July). *The first year experience: Starting with the student*. Paper presented at the 7th Pacific Rim First Year in Higher Education Conference, 'Enhancing the Transition to Higher Education', Brisbane, Australia. Available from http://www.fyhe.qut.edu.au/past_papers/papers03/Refereed%20Papers/Strategies%20&%20Innovations/Howells_ab.htm
- Huijser, H., & Kimmins, L. (2005, December). *PALS online and community building: A contradiction in terms? Paper presented at the 22nd ascilite Conference, 'Balance, Fidelity, Mobility: Maintaining the Momentum?'*, Brisbane, Australia. Retrieved from http://www.ascilite.org.au/conferences/brisbane05/blogs/proceedings/32_Huijser.pdf
- Humphrey, W. (1989). *Managing the software process*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Hunter, S., & Linder, C. (2005). First-year seminars. In M. Upcraft, J. Gardner, & B. Barefoot (Eds.), *Challenging and supporting the first year student: A handbook for improving the first year of college* (pp. 275–291). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Huntly, H., & Donovan, J. (2009). Developing academic persistence in first year tertiary students: A case study. *Studies in Learning, Evaluation, Innovation and Development*, 6(1), 16–29.
- Jackling, B., & Natoli, R. (2010, July). *Investigating business student engagement at an Australian university*. Paper presented at the 33rd HERDSA Annual Conference, 'Reshaping Higher Education', Melbourne, Australia. Retrieved from http://www.herdsa.org.au/wp-content/uploads/conference/2010/papers/HERDSA2010_Jackling_B.pdf

- James, R. (2002). Students' changing expectations of higher education and the consequences of mismatches with reality. *Responding to student expectations* (pp. 71–83). Paris, France: OECD Publications.
- James, R., Baldwin, G., Coates, H., Krause, K-L., & McInnis, C. (2004). *Analysis of equity groups in higher education 1991–2002*. Melbourne, Australia: Centre for the Study of Higher Education, The University of Melbourne.
- James, R., Baldwin, G., & McInnis, C. (1999). *Which university? The factors influencing the choices of prospective undergraduates* (99/3). Canberra: Australian Government Publishing Service. Retrieved from <http://www.dest.gov.au/archive/highered/eippubs/99-3/execsum.htm>
- James, R., Bexley, E., Devlin, M., & Marginson, S. (2007). *Australian university student finances 2006. Final report of a national survey of students in public universities* [Report prepared for Universities Australia]. Melbourne, Australia: Centre for the Study of Higher Education, The University of Melbourne. Retrieved from <http://www.universitiesaustralia.edu.au/resources/272/135>
- James, R., Krause, K-L., & Jennings, C. (2010). *The first year experience in Australian universities: Findings from 1994 to 2009*. Melbourne, Australia: Centre for the Study of Higher Education, The University of Melbourne.
- James, R., McInnis, C., & Devlin, M. (2002). *Assessing learning in Australian universities* [Report prepared for the Australian Universities Teaching Committee]. Melbourne, Australia: Centre for the Study of Higher Education, The University of Melbourne. Retrieved from <http://www.cshe.unimelb.edu.au/assessinglearning/docs/AssessingLearning.pdf>
- Jane, B. (2002, December). *Decoding the mentoring experience: A conversation with Parker Palmer*. Paper presented at the Australian Association for Research in Education Annual Conference, Brisbane, Australia. Retrieved from <http://www.aare.edu.au/02pap/jan02265.htm>
- Jardine, A. (2005). How student services can influence the factors that relate to student persistence. *Journal of the Australian and New Zealand Student Services Association*, 26, 20–32. Available from <http://www.adcet.edu.au/Anzssa/view.aspx?id=7413>
- Jarkey, N. (2004, July). *Orientation as an ongoing learning experience: Student focused and holistic*. Paper presented at the 27th HERDSA Annual Conference, 'Transforming Knowledge into Wisdom: Holistic Approaches to Teaching and Learning', Miri, Sarawak. Retrieved from <http://www.herdsa.org.au/wp-content/uploads/conference/2004/papers/jarkey.pdf>
- John N. Gardner Institute for Excellence in Undergraduate Education. (2005). *Foundational Dimensions® (Four-Year College Version)*. Retrieved from <http://www.fyfoundations.org/4year.aspx>
- Johnson, E. (2008). An investigation into pedagogical challenges facing international tertiary-level students in New Zealand. *Higher Education Research & Development*, 27(3), 231–243. doi: 10.1080/07294360802183796
- Johnston, C. (2001). Student perceptions of learning in first year in an economics and commerce faculty. *Higher Education Research & Development*, 20(2), 169–184. doi: 10.1080/07294360123345
- Johnston, H., Duff, A., & Quinn, D. (2009). Cutting the cloth to fit new needs and communication preferences. *Journal of the Education Research Group of Adelaide*, 1(2), 27–38. Available from http://www.adelaide.edu.au/erga/ergo/0102/ergo_v1n2_p5-14.pdf
- Jorgensen, L., Gordon, B., & Slater, G. (2001, December). *Intervening to improve access to university of students from under represented groups within low decile schools*. Paper presented at the Australian Association for Research in Education Annual Conference, Melbourne, Australia. Retrieved from <http://www.aare.edu.au/01pap/jor01189.htm>
- Kantanis, T. (2000a). The role of social transition in students' adjustment to the first-year of university. *Journal of Institutional Research*, 9(1), 100–110. Available from <http://www.air.org.au/journal/volume-9-no-1>
- Kantanis, T. (2000b). *Transition to university – a holistic approach: A case study of the Monash Transition Program*. Paper presented at the 4th Pacific Rim First Year in Higher Education Conference, 'Creating Futures for a New Millennium', Brisbane, Australia. Available from http://www.fyhe.com.au/past_papers/abstracts/KantanisAbstract.htm

- Kantanis, T. (2002, July). *Same or different: Issues that affect mature age undergraduate students' transition to university*. Paper presented at the 6th Pacific Rim First Year in Higher Education Conference, 'Changing Agendas "Te Ao Hurihuri"', Christchurch, New Zealand. Available from http://www.fyhe.com.au/past_papers/papers02.htm
- Kazlauskas, A., Gimel, S., Thornton, L., Thomas, T., & Davis, T. (2007, July). *Embedding group work in the first year experience*. Paper presented at the 10th Pacific Rim First Year in Higher Education Conference, 'Engage, Regenerate, Experiment', Brisbane, Australia. Retrieved from http://www.fyhe.qut.edu.au/past_papers/papers07/final_papers/pdfs/1d.pdf
- Kearney, J., & Donaghy, M. (2010, June). *Bridges and barriers to success for Pacific Islanders completing their first year at an Australian university*. Paper presented at the 13th Pacific Rim First Year in Higher Education Conference, 'Aspiration, Access, Achievement', Adelaide, Australia. Retrieved from http://www.fyhe.com.au/past_papers/papers10/content/pdf/7F.pdf
- Kennedy, G., Dalgarno, B., Bennett, S., Judd, T., Gray, K., & Chang, R. (2008, November–December). *Immigrants and natives: Investigating differences between staff and students' use of technology*. Paper presented at the 25th ascilite Conference, 'Hello! Where are You in the Landscape of Educational Technology?', Melbourne, Australia. Retrieved from <http://www.ascilite.org.au/conferences/melbourne08/procs/kennedy.pdf>
- Kennedy, G., Krause, K-L., Maton, K., Bishop, A., Chang, R., Waycott, J., ... Dalgarno, B. (2009). *Educating the Net Generation: Implications for learning and teaching in Australian universities* [Final report]. Sydney, Australia: Australian Learning and Teaching Council. Retrieved from <http://www.altc.edu.au/project-educating-net-generation-melbourne-2006>
- Kerr, R., & Amirthalingam, V. (2010, January). *Managing professional judgment in an undergraduate presentation assessment using consensus moderation*. Paper presented at the 19th annual Teaching and Learning Forum, 'Educating for Sustainability', Perth, Australia. Retrieved from <http://otl.curtin.edu.au/tlf/tlf2010/abstracts.html#kerr>
- Kidman, J., & Stevens, K. (2009). A four stage process of co-operative teaching for beginning university teachers meeting first year university students. *New Zealand Journal of Teachers' Work*, 6(1), 71–78. Retrieved from http://www.teacherswork.ac.nz/journal/volume6_issue1/kidman.pdf
- Kift, S. (2002, July). *Assuring quality in the casualisation of teaching, learning and assessment: Towards best practice for the first year experience*. Paper presented at the 6th Pacific Rim First Year in Higher Education Conference, 'Changing Agendas "Te Ao Hurihuri"', Christchurch, New Zealand. Available from http://www.fyhe.com.au/past_papers/papers02.htm
- Kift, S. (2003, July). *First year renewal to engage learners in law*. Paper presented at the 7th Pacific Rim First Year in Higher Education Conference, 'Enhancing Transition to Higher Education', Brisbane, Australia. Retrieved from http://www.fyhe.com.au/past_papers/papers03/Refereed%20Papers/Transition%20&%20Adjustment/Kift_ab.doc
- Kift, S. (2004, July). *Organising first year engagement around learning: Formal and informal curriculum intervention*. Keynote address presented at the 8th Pacific Rim First Year in Higher Education Conference, 'Dealing with Diversity', Melbourne, Australia. Available from http://www.fyhe.com.au/past_papers/papers04.htm
- Kift, S. (2007). *First year student experience final report 2007*. Brisbane, Australia: Queensland University of Technology. Retrieved from <http://www.fyhe.qut.edu.au/research/documents/FYEFinalReport.pdf>
- Kift, S. (2008, July). *The next, great first year challenge: Sustaining, coordinating and embedding coherent institution-wide approaches to enact the FYE as "everybody's business"*. Keynote address presented at the 11th Pacific Rim First Year in Higher Education Conference, 'An Apple for the Learner: Celebrating the First Year Experience', Hobart, Australia. Retrieved from http://www.fyhe.qut.edu.au/past_papers/papers08/FYHE2008/content/pdfs/Keynote%20-%20Kift.pdf
- Kift, S. (2009a). *Articulating a transition pedagogy to scaffold and to enhance the first year student learning experience in Australian higher education. Final report for ALTC Senior Fellowship Program*. Sydney, Australia: Australian Learning and Teaching Council. Available from <http://www.altc.edu.au/resource-transition-pedagogy-report-qut-2009>
- Kift, S. (2009b). A transition pedagogy: The first year experience curriculum design symposium 2009. *HERDSA News*, 31(1), 1, 3–4. Available from <http://www.herdsa.org.au/wp-content/uploads/herdsa-news-311-april-2009.pdf>

- Kift, S. (2009c, February). *Harnessing ePortfolio to support and enhance the first year student experience*. Invited address at the Australian ePortfolio Symposium 2009, Queensland University of Technology, Brisbane, Australia. Available from <http://www.eportfolioppractice.qut.edu.au/symposium2/program.jsp>
- Kift, S., & Field, R. (2009, June–July). *Intentional first year curriculum design as a means of facilitating student engagement: Some exemplars*. Paper presented at the 12th Pacific Rim First Year in Higher Education Conference, 'Preparing for Tomorrow Today: The First Year Experience as Foundation', Townsville, Australia. Retrieved from http://www.fyhe.com.au/past_papers/papers09/content/pdf/16D.pdf
- Kift, S., & Moody, K. (2009, November). *Harnessing assessment and feedback in the first year to support learning success, engagement and retention*. Paper presented at the ATN Assessment Conference, Melbourne, Australia. Retrieved from <http://eprints.qut.edu.au/28849/1/28849.pdf>
- Kift, S., & Nelson, K. (2005, July). *Beyond curriculum reform: Embedding the transition experience*. Paper presented at the 28th HERDSA Annual Conference, 'Higher Education in a Changing World', Sydney, Australia. Retrieved from <http://www.herdsa.org.au/wp-content/uploads/conference/2005/papers/kift.pdf>
- Kift, S., Nelson, K., & Clarke, J. (2010). Transition pedagogy: A third generation approach to FYE—A case study of policy and practice for the higher education sector. *International Journal of the First Year in Higher Education*, 1(1), 1–20. doi: 10.5204/intfyhe.v1i1.13
- Kinnear, A., Boyce, M., Sparrow, H., Middleton, S., & Cullity, M. (2009). *Diversity: A longitudinal study of how student diversity relates to resilience and successful progression in a new generation university* [Final report]. Sydney, Australia: Australian Learning and Teaching Council. Retrieved from <http://www.altc.edu.au/project-diversity-longitudinal-study-how-ecu-2006>
- Kirby, D., Dluzewska, T., & Andrews, L. (2009, June–July). *Appreciating diversity: Transforming learning communities*. Paper presented at the 12th Pacific Rim First Year in Higher Education Conference, 'Preparing for Tomorrow Today: The First Year as Foundation', Townsville, Australia. Retrieved from http://www.fyhe.com.au/past_papers/papers09/content/pdf/16B.pdf
- Kirkness, A., Neill, L., & Naidoo, K. (2007). Evaluating reading material for first year university students: A case study of collaboration between a discipline teacher and an academic developer. In G. Crisp & M. Hicks (Eds.), *Enhancing higher education, theory and scholarship: Proceedings of the 30th HERDSA Annual Conference*. Adelaide, Australia: Higher Education Research and Development Society of Australasia.
- Knewstubb, B., & Bond, C. (2009). What's he talking about? The communicative alignment between a teacher's intentions and students' understandings. *Higher Education Research & Development*, 28(2), 179–193. doi: 10.1080/07294360902725058
- Kochikar, V. (2002). The Knowledge Management Maturity Model: A staged framework for leveraging knowledge. *KM World*. Available from <http://whitepapers.zdnet.co.uk/0,39025945,60008205p,00.htm>
- Koppi, T., Nolan, E., & Field, D. (2010). Developing transferable research skills in first year agricultural economics students. *Journal of University Teaching & Learning Practice*, 7(2). Available from <http://ro.uow.edu.au/jutlp/vol7/iss2/6>
- Krause, K-L. (2001). The university essay writing experience: A pathway for academic integration during transition. *Higher Education Research & Development*, 20(2), 147–168. doi: 10.1080/07294360123586
- Krause, K-L., & Coates, H. (2008). Students' engagement in first-year university. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 33(5), 493–505. doi: 10.1080/02602930701698892
- Krause, K-L., & Duchesne, S. (2000, July). *With a little help from my friends: Social interactions on campus and their role in the first year experience*. Paper presented at the 4th Pacific Rim First Year in Higher Education Conference, 'Creating Futures for a New Millennium', Brisbane, Australia. Available from http://www.fyhe.com.au/past_papers/abstracts/KrauseAbstract.htm
- Krause, K-L., Harris, K-L., Garnett, R., Gleeson, D., Peat, M., & Taylor, C. (2007). *Enhancing the assessment of learning in Australian higher education: Biological sciences* [Final report]. Sydney, Australia: Carrick Institute for Learning and Teaching in Higher Education. Available from <http://www.altc.edu.au/resources?text=enhancing+the+assessment+in+the+biological>

- Krause, K-L., Hartley, R., James, R., & McInnis, C. (2005). *The first year experience in Australian universities: Findings from a decade of national studies*. Melbourne, Australia: Centre for the Study of Higher Education, The University of Melbourne.
- Krause, K-L., & McEwen, C. (2009, July). *Engaging and retaining students online: A case study*. Paper presented at the 32nd HERDSA Annual Conference, 'The Student Experience', Darwin, Australia. Retrieved from http://www.herdsa.org.au/wp-content/uploads/conference/2009/papers/HERDSA2009_Krause_K.pdf
- Kuh, G. (2007, July). *What matters to student success in the first year of university?* Keynote address presented at the 10th Pacific Rim First Year in Higher Education Conference, 'Regenerate, Engage, Experiment', Brisbane, Australia. Available from http://www.fyhe.com.au/past_papers/papers07/fullprogram2.html
- Larcombe, W., & Malkin, I. (2008). Identifying students likely to benefit from language support in first-year Law. *Higher Education Research & Development*, 27(4), 319–329. doi: 10.1080/07294360802406791
- Lawrence, J. (2001). Academics and first-year students: Collaborating to access success in an unfamiliar university culture. *Widening Participation and Lifelong Learning*, 3(3), 4–14. Available from <http://eprints.usq.edu.au/5475>
- Lawrence, J. (2002, July). *The 'deficit-discourse' shift: University teachers and their role in helping first year students persevere and succeed in the new university culture*. Paper presented at the 6th Pacific Rim First Year in Higher Education Conference, 'Changing Agendas "Te Ao Hurihuri"', Christchurch, New Zealand. Available from http://www.fyhe.com.au/past_papers/papers02.htm
- Lawrence, J. (2003, March). The 'deficit-discourse' shift: University teachers and their role in helping first year students persevere and succeed in the new university culture. *ultiBASE*. Retrieved from <http://ultibase.rmit.edu.au/Articles/march03/lawrence1.htm>
- Lawrence, J. (2005). Re-conceptualising attrition and retention: Integrating theoretical, research and student perspectives. *Studies in Learning, Evaluation, Innovation and Development*, 2(3), 16–33.
- Lawrence, J., Loch, B., & Galligan, L. (2010, July). *Employing interdisciplinary collaborations to redefine academic practices in a university Nursing program*. Paper presented at the 33rd HERDSA Annual Conference, 'Reshaping Higher Education', Melbourne, Australia. Retrieved from http://www.herdsa.org.au/wp-content/uploads/conference/2010/papers/HERDSA2010_Lawrence_J.pdf
- Leach, L., & Zepke, N. (2010). Making it into the pipeline: Transitions from school to tertiary education. *Journal of Adult Learning Aotearoa New Zealand*, 38(1), 5–22.
- Levin, E. (2001, November). *Making expectations explicit*. Paper presented at the Biennial Language and Academic Skills in Higher Education, 'Sources of Confusion', Melbourne, Australia. Retrieved from <http://aall.org.au/sites/default/files/2001%20Proceedings.doc>
- Levin, E., & Tempone, I. (2002, June). *Providing guidelines for first-year assessment tasks as a means of developing core graduate attributes: Nurturing or spoonfeeding?* Paper presented at the 2nd International Lifelong Learning Conference, Yeppoon, Australia. Retrieved from http://web.archive.org/web/*/http://lifelonglearning.cqu.edu.au/2002/papers/Levin_Tempone.pdf
- Levy, S., & Murray, J. (2002, July). *Transition to success: Analysis of Monash University's DoFS program and student performance*. Paper presented at the 6th Pacific Rim First Year in Higher Education Conference, 'Changing Agendas "Te Ao Hurihuri"', Christchurch, New Zealand. Available from http://www.fyhe.com.au/past_papers/papers02.htm
- Levy, S., & Murray, J. (2003, July). *The transition of "at risk" students: Strategies for success*. Paper presented at the 7th Pacific Rim First Year in Higher Education Conference, 'Enhancing the Transition to Higher Education', Brisbane, Australia. Available from http://www.fyhe.com.au/past_papers/papers03.htm
- Lewis, D., O'Brien, M., Rogan, S., & Shorten, B. (2005). *Do students benefit from supplemental education? Evidence from a first-year statistics subject in economics and business* (Economics Working Paper 05-21). Available from University of Wollongong website: <http://ro.uow.edu.au/commwkpapers/127>
- Lilje, O., & Peat, M. (2010, June). *The development over two years of an online formative and summative writing tool used by first year biology students*. Paper presented at the 13th Pacific Rim First Year in Higher Education Conference, 'Aspiration, Access, Achievement', Adelaide, Australia. Retrieved from http://www.fyhe.com.au/past_papers/papers10/content/pdf/7B.pdf

- Lintern, S., Johnston, H., & O'Regan, K. (2001). The changing face of orientation: Strategies from student services. *Journal of the Australian and New Zealand Student Services Association*, 18, 4–19. Available from <http://www.adcet.edu.au/anzssa/View.aspx?id=7418>
- Lizzio, A. (2006). *Designing an orientation and transition strategy for commencing students. A conceptual summary of research and practice* (First Year Experience Project, Griffith University). Retrieved from http://www.griffith.edu.au/__data/assets/pdf_file/0008/51875/Alfs-5-Senors-Paper-FYE-Project,-2006.pdf
- Lizzio, A., & Wilson, K. (2004). First-year students' perceptions of capability. *Studies in Higher Education*, 29(1), 109–128. doi: 10.1080/1234567032000164903
- Long, M., Ferrier, F., & Heagney, M. (2006). *Stay, play or give it away? Students continuing, changing or leaving university study in their first year* [Report]. Melbourne, Australia: Centre for the Economics of Education and Training, Monash University. Available from http://www.dest.gov.au/sectors/higher_education/publications_resources/profiles/stay_play_giveaway.htm
- Lu, J., Yao, J., Chin, K-L., XIAO, J., & Xu, J. (2010). *Strategies and approaches to teaching and learning cross cultures* [Final report]. Sydney, Australia: Australian Learning and Teaching Council. Retrieved from <http://www.altc.edu.au/project-strategies-approaches-teaching-uts-2007>
- Lupton, M. (2008). Evidence, argument and social responsibility: First-year students' experiences of information literacy when researching an essay. *Higher Education Research & Development*, 27(4), 399–414. doi: 10.1080/07294360802406858
- Luzeckyj, A., Burke da Silva, K., Scutter, S., Palmer, E., & Brinkworth, R. (2010, June–July). "Don't ask me what I think of you I might not give the answer that you want me to": An exploration of 1st year university students' expectations and experiences from the students' and the teachers' perspectives. A Nuts & Bolts presentation at the 13th Pacific Rim First Year in Higher Education Conference, 'Aspiration, Access, Achievement', Adelaide, Australia. Retrieved from http://www.fyhe.com.au/past_papers/papers10/content/pdf/9F.pdf
- Lynch, G., & Paasuke, P. (2010, December). *Key elements of the tutorial support management model*. Paper presented at the 27th ascilite Conference, 'Curriculum, Technology and Transformation for an Unknown Future', Sydney, Australia. Retrieved from <http://www.ascilite.org.au/conferences/sydney10/Ascilite%20conference%20proceedings%202010/Lynchg-full.pdf>
- Macdonald, I. (2000). What do we mean by transition, and what is the problem? *Australasian Journal of Engineering Education*, 9(1), 7–20. Available from http://www.aee.com.au/journal/AJEEv9n1_2000.pdf
- MacGillivray, H., & Wilson, T. (2008). *Quantitative diversity: Disciplinary and cross-disciplinary mathematics and statistics support in Australian universities* [Final report]. Sydney, Australia: Australian Learning and Teaching Council. Available from <http://www.altc.edu.au/project-quantitative-diversity-disciplinary-qut-2006>
- Macken, C. (2009, June–July). *A lecturer's toolbox: A "just-in-time" approach for high quality first year student experience*. A Nuts & Bolts presentation the 12th Pacific Rim First Year in Higher Education Conference, 'Preparing for Tomorrow Today: The First Year as Foundation', Townsville, Australia. Retrieved from http://www.fyhe.com.au/past_papers/papers09/content/pdf/4D.pdf
- Macken, C. (2010, June). *Thumbs up! Thumbs down! A 5-step assessment approach to enhance first year assessment practice*. A Nuts & Bolts presentation at the 13th Pacific Rim First Year in Higher Education Conference, 'Aspiration, Access, Achievement', Adelaide, Australia. Retrieved from http://www.fyhe.com.au/past_papers/papers10/content/pdf/8B.pdf
- MacPherson, K. (2002). Problem-solving ability and cognitive maturity in undergraduate students. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 27(1), 5–22. doi: 10.1080/02602930120105027
- Madigan, V. (2006). Predicting prehospital care students' first-year academic performance. *Prehospital Emergency Care*, 10(1), 81–88. doi: 10.1080/10903120500366037
- Maldoni, A., Kennelly, R., & Davies, D. (2007). A discipline support program (DSP) for students from a non-English speaking background at the University of Canberra in Introduction to Management: A work in progress. *HERDSA News*, 29(1), 11–13. Available from http://www.herdsa.org.au/?page_id=154

- Male, S., & Lawrence, W. (2002, February). *Support schemes for first year computing students and electrical and computer engineering students at Curtin University of Technology*. Paper presented at the 11th annual Teaching and Learning Forum, 'Focusing on the Student', Perth, Australia.
- Mandel, R., Harper, J., Moore, D., & Addinsall, M. (2005, September). *Team Botany 2005: Operation saturation/satiation teaching*. Paper presented at the Charles Sturt University Learning and Teaching Conference, 'Bright Ideas and Evolving Evidence', Bathurst, Australia. Retrieved from <http://louisewww.mit.csu.edu.au/division/landt/resources/documents/ltconf/proceedings.pdf>
- Marrington, A., Nelson, K., & Clarke, J. (2010, June). *An economic case for systematic student monitoring and intervention in the first year in higher education*. A Nuts & Bolts presentation at the 13th Pacific Rim First Year in Higher Education Conference, 'Aspiration, Access, Achievement', Adelaide, Australia. Available from http://www.fyhe.com.au/past_papers/papers10/content/pdf/6D.pdf
- Marshall, S., & Mitchell, G. (2007, April–May). *Benchmarking international e-learning capability with the E-Learning Maturity Model*. Paper presented at the EDUCAUSE in Australasia Conference, Melbourne, Australia. Retrieved from http://www.caudit.edu.au/educauseaustralasia07/authors_papers/Marshall-103.pdf
- Martin-Lynch, P. (2010, January). *Teaching for persistence and achievement*. Paper presented at the 19th annual Teaching and Learning Forum, 'Educating for Sustainability', Perth, Australia. Retrieved from <http://otl.curtin.edu.au/tlf/tlf2010/abstracts.html#martin-lynch>
- Mason-Rogers, C. (2002, July). "Strategies for success in transition years" "Ma te huruhuru te mana, ka rere mai": A comprehensive portfolio of retention and success strategies at AUT seven years on from the 1995 inaugural Pacific First Year Experience Conference. Paper presented at the 6th Pacific Rim First Year in Higher Education Conference, 'Changing Agendas "Te Ao Hurihuri"', Christchurch, New Zealand. Available from http://www.fyhe.com.au/past_papers/papers02.htm
- Matthews, K., Adams, P., & Gannaway, D. (2009, June–July). *The impact of social learning spaces on student engagement*. Paper presented at the 12th Pacific Rim First Year in Higher Education Conference, 'Preparing for Tomorrow Today: The First Year as Foundation', Townsville, Australia. Retrieved from http://www.fyhe.com.au/past_papers/papers09/content/pdf/3A.pdf
- Matthews, K., Moni, R. W., & Moni, K. B. (2010, June). *Using dimensions of teaching practice to contextualise equity and transition: A case study in first-year human biology*. Paper presented at the 13th Pacific Rim First Year in Higher Education Conference, 'Aspiration, Access, Achievement', Adelaide, Australia. Retrieved from http://www.fyhe.com.au/past_papers/papers10/content/pdf/6B.pdf
- McAlpine, I., Reidsema, C., & Allen, B. (2006, December). *Educational design and online support for an innovative project-based course in engineering design*. Paper presented at the 23rd ascilite Conference, 'Who's Learning? Whose Technology?', Sydney, Australia. Retrieved from http://www.ascilite.org.au/conferences/sydney06/proceeding/pdf_papers/p168.pdf
- McCarthy, J. (2009, December). *Using social media to enhance the first year experience*. Paper presented at the 26th ascilite Conference, 'Same Places, Different Spaces', Auckland, New Zealand. Retrieved from <http://www.ascilite.org.au/conferences/auckland09/procs/mccarthy.pdf>
- McCreery, C. (2005). Less is more: Rethinking assessment in a first-year history unit. *Synergy*, 22. Available from <http://www.itl.usyd.edu.au/synergy/article.cfm?articleID=265>
- McGowan, U. (2003, July). *Plagiarism detection and prevention. Pedagogical implications for lecturers of first year university students*. Paper presented at the 7th Pacific Rim First Year in Higher Education Conference, 'Enhancing the Transition to Higher Education', Brisbane, Australia. Available from http://www.fyhe.com.au/past_papers/papers03.htm
- McInnis, C. (2001). Researching the first year experience: Where to from here? *Higher Education Research & Development* 20(2), 105–114. doi: 10.1080/07294360125188
- McInnis, C., Hartley, R., Polesel, J., & Teese, R. (2000). *Non-completion in vocational education and training and higher education*. Canberra, Australia: Department of Employment, Education, Training and Youth Affairs. Retrieved from <http://www.dest.gov.au/archive/research/docs/final.pdf>
- McInnis, C., James, R., & Hartley, R. (2000). *Trends in the first year experience in Australian universities*. Melbourne, Australia: Centre for the Study of Higher Education, The University of Melbourne.

- McInnis, C., James, R., & McNaught, C. (1995). *First year on campus: Diversity in the initial experience of Australian graduates* [Report prepared for the Committee for the Advancement of University Teaching]. Canberra, Australia: Australian Government Publishing Service.
- McKauge, L., Emmerton, L., Bond, J., Steadman, K., Green, W., Sweep, T., & Cole, M. (2009, July). *An initiative to improve the professional communication skills of first-year pharmacy students*. Paper presented at the 32nd HERDSA Annual Conference, 'The Student Experience', Darwin, Australia. Retrieved from http://www.herdsa.org.au/wp-content/uploads/conference/2009/papers/HERDSA2009_McKauge_L.pdf
- McKenzie, K., Gow, K., & Schweitzer, R. (2004). Exploring first-year academic achievement through structural equation modelling. *Higher Education Research & Development*, 23(1), 95–112. doi: 10.1080/0729436032000168513
- McKenzie, K., & Schweitzer, R. (2001). Who succeeds at university? Factors predicting academic performance in first year Australian university students. *Higher Education Research & Development*, 20(1), 21–33. doi: 10.1080/07924360120043621
- McLaughlin, M. (2003) *Tertiary education policy in New Zealand* [Report prepared as part of a Fulbright Fellowship]. Available from Fulbright New Zealand website: <http://www.fulbright.org.nz/voices/axford/mclaughlinm.html>
- McLaughlin, P., & Mills, A. (2009). Where shall the future student learn? Student expectations of university facilities for teaching and learning. *Synergy*, 7(1), 8–13.
- McLennan, T., & Gibbs, S. (2008, November–December). *Has the computing competence of first year university students increased during the last decade?* Paper presented at the 25th ascilite Conference, 'Hello! Where are You in the Landscape of Educational Technology?', Melbourne, Australia. Retrieved from <http://www.ascilite.org.au/conferences/melbourne08/procs/mclennan.pdf>
- McLeod, S. (Ed.). (2005). *Bright ideas and evolving evidence: Proceedings of the 2005 Charles Sturt University Learning and Teaching Conference*. Bathurst, Australia: Charles Sturt University.
- McLoughlin, C. (2002). The online experience: Implications of web-based learning for student support in the first year. *Journal of the Australian and New Zealand Student Services Association*, 19, 18–31. Available from <http://www.adcet.edu.au/anzssa/View.aspx?id=7438>
- McNamara, J., Field, R., & Brown, C. (2009, June–July). *Learning to reflect in the first year of legal education: The key to surviving legal education and legal practice*. Paper presented at the 12th Pacific Rim First Year in Higher Education Conference, 'Preparing for Tomorrow Today: The First Year as Foundation', Townsville, Australia. Retrieved from http://www.fyhe.com.au/past_papers/papers09/content/pdf/5B.pdf
- McNamara, L. (2000). Lecturing (and not lecturing) using the web: Developing a teaching strategy for web-based lectures: Flexible delivery in a first year law subject, part I. *Legal Education Review*, 11(2), 149–174. Available from http://www.ler.edu.au/pdf/volumes/ler_vol11_2_2000.pdf
- McPhail, R., Fisher, R., & McConachie, J. (2009, June–July). *Becoming a successful first year undergraduate: When expectations and reality collide*. Paper presented at the 12th Pacific Rim First Year in Higher Education Conference, 'Preparing for Tomorrow Today: The First Year as Foundation', Townsville, Australia. Retrieved from http://www.fyhe.com.au/past_papers/papers09/content/pdf/11D.pdf
- Meyer, J., & Shanahan, M. (2001). A triangulated approach to the modelling of learning outcomes in first year economics. *Higher Education Research & Development*, 20(2), 127–145. doi: 10.1080/07294360124988
- Meyer, J., & Shanahan, M. P. (2004). Developing metalearning capacity in students: Actionable theory and practical lessons learned in first-year economics. *Innovations in Education and Teaching International*, 41(4), 443–458. doi: 10.1080/1470329042000277020
- Miller, K., Calder, C., Martin, A., McIntyre, M., Pottinger, I., & Smyth, G. (2008). *Quality enhancement themes: The first year experience. Personal development planning in the first year*. Glasgow, United Kingdom: The Quality Assurance Agency for Higher Education. Retrieved from <http://www.enhancementthemes.ac.uk/themes/FirstYear/default.asp>
- Miller, V., Oldfield, E., & Bulmer, M. (2004, October). *Peer assisted study sessions (PASS) in first year chemistry and statistics courses: Insights and evaluations*. Paper presented at the Symposium on Scholarly Inquiry in Science Teaching and Learning, Sydney, Australia. Retrieved from <http://science.uniserve.edu.au/pubs/procs/wshop9/schws003.pdf>
- Mir, M., & Rahaman, A. (2007). Off the radar: The problem of distance-learning in "integrated" degrees. *Australian Universities' Review*, 49(1,2), 39–47. Available from <http://www.aur.org.au/archive/2000s>

- Moffat, A., Hughes, B., Sondergaard, H., & Gruba, P. (2005, January). *Making connections: First year transition for computer science and software engineering students*. Paper presented at the 7th Australasian Computing Education Conference, Newcastle, Australia. Retrieved from <http://crpit.com/confpapers/CRPITV42Moffat.pdf>
- Moir, J. (2010, June). *People prepared to make a difference—tanga tu, tangata ora*. A Nuts & Bolts presentation at the 13th Pacific Rim First Year in Higher Education Conference, 'Aspiration, Access, Achievement', Adelaide, Australia. Retrieved from http://www.fyhe.com.au/past_papers/papers10/content/pdf/14D.pdf
- Morda, R., Sonn, C., Ali, L., & Ohtsuka, K. (2007, July). *Using a student centred approach to explore issues affecting student transition*. Paper presented at the 30th HERDSA Annual Conference, 'Enhancing Higher Education, Theory and Scholarship', Adelaide, Australia. Retrieved from <http://www.herdsa.org.au/wp-content/uploads/conference/2007/PDF/REF/p158.pdf>
- Morgan, D. (2003, July). *Assessing first year students: A case for mixed mode assessment*. Paper presented at the 7th Pacific Rim First Year in Higher Education Conference, 'Enhancing the Transition to Higher Education', Brisbane, Australia. Available from http://www.fyhe.com.au/past_papers/papers03.htm
- Morgan, S. (2009, June–July). *Social skills for new students: Giving students the skills today to make friends tomorrow*. Paper presented at the 12th Pacific Rim First Year in Higher Education Conference, 'Preparing for Tomorrow Today: The First Year as Foundation', Townsville, Australia. Retrieved from http://www.fyhe.com.au/past_papers/papers09/content/pdf/6D.pdf
- Morris, M., Porter, A., & Griffiths, D. (2004). Assessment is bloomin' luvly: Developing assessment that enhances learning. *Journal of University Teaching & Learning Practice*, 1(2). Available from <http://ro.uow.edu.au/jutlp/vol1/iss2/5>
- Morrison, A. (2000, July). *Space for Māori in tertiary institutions*. Paper presented at the 4th Pacific Rim First Year in Higher Education Conference, 'Creating Futures for a New Millennium', Brisbane, Australia. Available from http://www.fyhe.com.au/past_papers/papers00.htm
- Muckert, T. (2002). *Investigating the student attrition process and the contribution of peer-mentoring interventions in an Australian first year university program* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Griffith University, Brisbane, Australia.
- Muldoon, N., & Lee, C. (2005, September). *Constructive alignment: A curriculum design approach in accounting education*. Paper presented at the Charles Sturt University Learning and Teaching Conference, 'Bright Ideas and Evolving Evidence', Bathurst, Australia. Retrieved from <http://louisewww.mit.csu.edu.au/division/landt/resources/documents/ltconf/proceedings.pdf>
- Muldoon, R. (2003, November). *The faculty mentor program: An initiative to support the transition to university of on-campus students at a regional university*. Paper presented at the Biennial Language and Academic Skills in Higher Education Conference, Adelaide, Australia. Retrieved from <http://www.aall.org.au/sites/default/files/LAS2003%20BIENNIAL%20CONFERENCE.pdf>
- Muldoon, R., & Macdonald, I. (2009). Building learning communities in residential colleges. *Journal of University Teaching and Learning Practice*, 6(2). Available from <http://ro.uow.edu.au/jutlp/vol6/iss2/5>
- Murphy, T., Edlin, A., Everiss, L., McClew, J., Margrain, V., & Meade, A. (2006). *Effective teacher education practice: The impact of written assessment feedback for distance learners* [Final report]. Wellington, New Zealand: Teaching and Learning Research Initiative. Retrieved from http://www.tlri.org.nz/assets/A_Project-PDFs/9232_finalreport.pdf
- Murray, N. (2010). Conceptualising the English language needs of first year university students. *International Journal of the First Year in Higher Education*, 1(1), 55–64. doi: 10.5204/intjfyhe.v1i1.19
- Nash, S. (2009). *First year extramural student mentoring* [Research project carried out under the auspices of Ako Aotearoa, The National Centre for Teaching Excellence, Wellington, New Zealand]. Available from the Ako Aotearoa website: <http://ako.aotearoa.ac.nz/research-register>
- Nelson, B. (2002). *Higher education at the crossroads: An overview paper*. Canberra, Australia: Commonwealth of Australia.
- Nelson, B. (2003). *Our universities: Backing Australia's future*. Canberra, Australia: Commonwealth of Australia.
- Nelson, K. (2009). *Kift ALTC senior fellowship: Articulating a transition pedagogy. Information technology case study*. Brisbane, Australia: Queensland University of Technology. Retrieved from http://www.fyhe.qut.edu.au/transitionpedagogy/casestudies/documents/Nelson_IT_CaseStudy_14Dec09.pdf

- Nelson, K., & Clarke, J. (2011). *Establishing a framework for transforming student engagement, success and retention in higher education institutions* [Australian Learning and Teaching Council project]. Queensland University of Technology, Brisbane, Australia.
- Nelson, K., Creagh, T., Kift, S., & Clarke, J. A. (2010). *Transition pedagogy handbook: A good practice guide for policy and practice in the first year experience*. Brisbane, Australia: First Year in Higher Education Centre, Queensland University of Technology. Retrieved from <http://www.fyhe.qut.edu.au/research/documents/TransitionPedagogyHandbookOct.pdf>
- Nelson, K., Duncan, M., & Clarke, J. (2009). Student success: The identification and support of first year university students at risk of attrition. *Studies in Learning, Evaluation, Innovation and Development*, 6(1), 1–15.
- Nelson, K., Kift, S., & Clarke, J. (2008, June–July). *Expectations and realities for first year students at an Australian university*. Paper presented at the 11th Pacific Rim First Year in Higher Education Conference, 'An Apple for the Learner: Celebrating the First Year Experience', Hobart, Australia. Available from http://www.fyhe.com.au/past_papers/papers08/FYHE2008/content/html/sessions.html
- Nelson, K., Kift, S., & Creagh, T. (2007, July). *Implementing a blueprint for transition success*. Paper presented at the 10th Pacific Rim First Year in Higher Education Conference, 'Engage, Regenerate, Experiment', Brisbane, Australia. Retrieved from http://www.fyhe.qut.edu.au/past_papers/papers07/final_papers/pdfs/4b.pdf
- Nelson, K., Kift, S., & Harper, W. (2005, December). *"First portal in a storm": A virtual space for transition students*. Paper presented at the 22nd ascilite Conference, 'Balance, Fidelity, Mobility: Maintaining the Momentum?', Brisbane, Australia. Retrieved from http://www.ascilite.org.au/conferences/brisbane05/blogs/proceedings/58_Nelson.pdf
- Nelson, K., Kift, S., Humphreys, J., & Harper, W. (2006, July). *A blueprint for enhanced transition: Taking an holistic approach to managing student transition into a large university*. Paper presented at the 9th Pacific Rim First Year in Higher Education Conference, 'Engaging Students', Gold Coast, Australia. Retrieved from http://www.fyhe.com.au/past_papers/2006/Papers/Kift.pdf
- New Zealand Ministry of Education. (2006). *OECD thematic review of tertiary education: New Zealand country background report*. Retrieved from the OECD website: <http://www.oecd.org/dataoecd/20/46/36441052.pdf>
- Nulty, D. (2010). *Peer and self-assessment in the first year of university*. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education* [Advance online publication]. doi: 10.1080/02602930903540983
- Nulty, D., & Müller, M. (2009, June–July). *"In the eye of the beholder": Exploring first year students' motives for choosing a particular foundation course*. Paper presented at the 12th Pacific Rim First Year in Higher Education Conference, 'Preparing for Tomorrow Today: The First Year as Foundation', Townsville, Australia. Retrieved from http://www.fyhe.com.au/past_papers/papers09/content/pdf/8E.pdf
- O'Byrne, J., & Thompson, R. (2005, September). *The tutorial benefits of on-line assignments: Mastering Physics in first year physics at the University of Sydney*. Paper presented at the Symposium on Blended Learning in Science Teaching and Learning, Sydney, Australia. Retrieved from http://sydney.edu.au/science/uniserve_science/pubs/procs/wshop10/2005Obyrne.pdf
- Oliver, R. (2006, July). *A technology-facilitated learning design supporting quality assurance for off-campus and off-shore course delivery*. Paper presented at the Australian Universities Quality Forum 2006, 'Quality Outcomes and Diversity', Perth, Australia. Retrieved from http://www.auqa.edu.au/files/publications/proceedings_2006_final.pdf
- O'Shea, S., & Lysaght, P. (2010, June). *From "Harry Potter" to "Bachelor Boy" and beyond: Bridging the gap between expectations and reality for first year students*. Paper presented at the 13th Pacific Rim First Year in Higher Education Conference, 'Aspiration, Access, Achievement', Adelaide, Australia. Retrieved from http://www.fyhe.com.au/past_papers/papers10/content/pdf/8E.pdf
- Papinczak, T., & Young, L. (2009). Academic achievement and problem-based learning: A pilot study. *Focus on Health Professional Education*, 10(3), 13–25.
- Papinczak, T., Young, L., Groves, M., & Haynes, M. (2008). Effects of a metacognitive intervention on students' approaches to learning and self-efficacy in a first year medical course. *Advances in Health Sciences Education*, 13(2), 213–232. doi: 10.1007/s10459-006-9036-0

- Parappilly, M., Quinton, J., & Andersson, G. (2009, July). *Enhancing the transition to university physics*. Paper presented at the 32nd HERDSA Annual Conference, 'The Student Experience', Darwin, Australia. Retrieved from http://www.herdsa.org.au/wp-content/uploads/conference/2009/papers/HERDSA2009_Parappilly_M.pdf
- Pargetter, R., McInnes, C., James, R., Evans, M., Peel, M., & Dobson, I. (1999). *Transition from secondary to tertiary: A performance study*. Retrieved from <http://www.dest.gov.au/archive/highered/hes/hes36.htm>
- Pascarella, E., & Terenzini, P. (2004). *How college affects students: A third decade of research*. San Francisco: Jossey Bass.
- Pascoe, V. (2008, June). "Is this that warm fuzzy stuff?" *Successfully engaging first year multimedia students in group processes*. Paper presented at the 5th International Lifelong Learning Conference, 'Lifelong Learning: Reflecting on Successes and Framing Futures', Yeppoon, Australia. Available from <http://hdl.cqu.edu.au/10018/13519>
- Paton, M. (2006, September). *Reflective journals and critical thinking*. Paper presented at the Symposium on Assessment in Science Teaching and Learning, Sydney, Australia. Retrieved from <http://science.uniserve.edu.au/pubs/procs/2006/paton.pdf>
- Paulk, M., Weber, C., Curtis, B., & Chrissis, M. (1995). *The capability maturity model for software: Guidelines for improving the software process* (SEI Series in Software Engineering). Boston, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Payne, T., Kirkpatrick, D., Goodacre, C., & McLean, P. (2006). *Creating accessible teaching and support for students with disabilities* [Final report]. Canberra, Australia: Carrick Institute for Learning and Teaching in Higher Education. Available from <http://www.altc.edu.au/project-creating-accessible-teaching-utas-2007>
- Pearce, A. (2009). *Commentary on first year curriculum case studies: Multiple entry points perspective*. Paper presented at the FYE Curriculum Design Symposium, 'Articulating a Transition Pedagogy', Brisbane, Australia. Available from <http://www.fyhe.qut.edu.au/transitionpedagogy/expertcommen/multipleentr.jsp>
- Pearson, M., Roberts, P., O'Shea, C., & Lupton, M. (2002, July). *An inclusive approach to transition in a research-led university*. Paper presented at the 6th Pacific Rim First Year in Higher Education Conference, 'Changing Agendas "Te Ao Hurihuri"', Christchurch, New Zealand. Available from http://www.fyhe.com.au/past_papers/papers02.htm
- Peat, M., Dalziel, J., & Grant, A. (2000). Enhancing the transition to university by facilitating social and study networks: Results of a one-day workshop. *Innovations in Education and Training International*, 37(4), 293–303. doi: 10.1080/135580000750052900
- Peat, M., Dalziel, J., & Grant, A. (2001). Enhancing the first year student experience by facilitating the development of peer networks through a one-day workshop. *Higher Education Research & Development*, 20(2), 199–215. doi: 10.1080/07294360123888
- Peat, M., & Franklin, S. (2002). Supporting students in their first year at university: The role of online learning. *Synergy*, 18, 12–13, 24.
- Peat, M., Franklin, S., Devlin, M., & Charles, M. (2005). Revisiting the impact of formative assessment opportunities on student learning. *Australasian Journal of Educational Technology*, 21(1), 102–117. Retrieved from <http://www.ascilite.org.au/ajet/ajet21/peat.html>
- Pelliccione, L., & Albon, R. (2004, January). *Beyond the comfort zone: Using informal mentoring to create lifelines for students in disequilibrium*. Paper presented at the 21st ascilite Conference, 'Beyond the Comfort Zone', Perth, Australia. Retrieved from <http://www.ascilite.org.au/conferences/perth04/procs/pelliccione.html>
- Penman, J., & White, F. (2006). Peer-mentoring program 'pop-up' model for regional nursing students. *Journal of University Teaching & Learning Practice*, 3(2). Available from <http://ro.uow.edu.au/jutlp/vol3/iss2/6>
- Pepper, C. (2010). 'There's a lot of learning going on but NOT much teaching!' Student perceptions of problem-based learning in science. *Higher Education Research & Development*, 29(6), 693–707. doi: 10.1080/07294360.2010.501073
- Perry, C., & Allard, A. (2003). Making the connections: Transition experiences for first-year education students. *Journal of Educational Enquiry*, 4(2), 74–89. Retrieved from <http://www.ojs.unisa.edu.au/index.php/EDEQ/article/viewFile/525/395>

- Pillay, H., Clarke, J., & Taylor, P. (2006). Learning agency in new learning environments: An Australian case study on the influence of context. In A. De Figueredo & A. Afonso (Eds.), *Managing learning in virtual settings: The role of context* (pp. 236–252). Hershey, PA: Idea Group Inc.
- Pitkethly, A., & Prosser, M. (2001). The First Year Experience Project: A model for university-wide change. *Higher Education Research & Development*, 20(2), 185–198. doi: 10.1080/758483470
- Potter, A., & Lynch, K. (2008, June–July). *Quality feedback on assessment: Apple for the teacher? How first year student perceptions of assessment feedback affect their engagement with study*. Paper presented at the 11th Pacific Rim First Year in Higher Education Conference, 'An Apple for the Learner: Celebrating the First Year Experience', Hobart, Australia. Available from http://www.fyhe.com.au/past_papers/papers08/FYHE2008/content/html/sessions.html
- Potter, A., & Parkinson, A. (2010, June). *First Year at Risk Intervention Pilot Project: An intervention to support first year students experiencing early assessment failure*. Paper presented at the 13th Pacific Rim First Year in Higher Education Conference, 'Aspiration, Access, Achievement', Adelaide, Australia. Available from http://www.fyhe.com.au/past_papers/papers10/content/html/sessions.html
- Powell, S., & Peel, M. (2000, July). *Monitoring and assisting student academic progress: Results of a student progress initiative in the Faculty of Arts at Monash University*. Paper presented at the 4th Pacific Rim First Year in Higher Education Conference, 'Creating Futures for a New Millennium', Brisbane, Australia. Available from http://www.fyhe.com.au/past_papers/abstracts/PowellAbstract.htm
- Prebble, T., Hargraves, H., Leach, L., Naidoo, K., Suddaby, G., & Zepke, N. (2004). *Impact of student support services and academic development programmes on student outcomes in undergraduate tertiary study: A synthesis of the research* [Report to the Ministry of Education]. Wellington, New Zealand: Ministry of Education. Retrieved from http://www.educationcounts.govt.nz/__data/assets/pdf_file/0013/7321/ugradstudentoutcomes.pdf
- Purnell, S. (2003, July). *A map, a bicycle and good weather: The transition to undergraduate study*. Paper presented at the 7th Pacific Rim First Year in Higher Education Conference, 'Enhancing the Transition to Higher Education', Brisbane, Australia. Available from http://www.fyhe.com.au/past_papers/papers03.htm
- Purnell, S. (2004, November). *The contribution of staff development to the development of strategies to meet the needs of first year students*. Paper presented at the SEDA Conference, 'Questioning the Impact of Staff and Educational Development', Birmingham, United Kingdom.
- Quinn, C., Smith, J., Duncan, M., Clarke, J., & Nelson, K. (2009, June–July). *The evolution of a community of practice at the Queensland University of Technology for lecturers involved in large first year units*. A Nuts & Bolts presentation at the 12th Pacific Rim First Year in Higher Education Conference, 'Preparing for Tomorrow Today: The First Year as Foundation', Townsville, Australia. Retrieved from http://www.fyhe.com.au/past_papers/papers09/content/pdf/8C.pdf
- Rayner, G., & Cridland, C. (2009, June–July). *Applying six principles of effective curriculum design in a first year essay feedback/assessment cycle*. Paper presented at the 12th Pacific Rim First Year in Higher Education Conference, 'Preparing for Tomorrow Today: The First Year as Foundation', Townsville, Australia. Retrieved from http://www.fyhe.com.au/past_papers/papers09/content/pdf/10B.pdf
- Read, J., George, A., Masters, A., & King, M. (2005, September). *Identifying the existence of barriers to students' learning from assessment results*. Paper presented at the Symposium on Blended Learning in Science Teaching and Learning, Sydney, Australia. Retrieved from <http://science.uniserve.edu.au/pubs/procs/wshop10/2005Read.pdf>
- Reid, E., & Solomonides, I. (2010, June). *Diverse transitions*. Paper presented at the 13th Pacific Rim First Year in Higher Education Conference, 'Aspiration, Access, Achievement', Adelaide, Australia. Available from http://www.fyhe.com.au/past_papers/papers10/content/html/sessions.html
- Rhoden, C., & Boin, K. (2004, November–December). *Transition strategies for international students*. Paper presented at the 15th ISANA International Conference, 'Challenging Education: Socio-cultural, Economic and Academic Outcomes', Melbourne, Australia. Retrieved from http://www.isana.org.au/files/20051017171637_TransitionStrategies.pdf
- Richardson, P., & Gough, J. (2001, December). *Becoming a mature-aged teacher: Career change into teaching*. Paper presented at the Australian Association for Research in the Education Annual Conference, Melbourne, Australia. Retrieved from <http://www.aare.edu.au/01pap/ric01274.htm>

- Richardson, S., & Coates, H. (2010). *AUSSE Research Briefing: Getting first-year students engaged*. Melbourne, Australia: Australian Council for Educational Research.
- Rienks, J., & Taylor, S. (2009, June–July). *Attrition and academic performance of students identified as at-risk using administrative data alone*. Paper presented at the 12th Pacific Rim First Year in Higher Education Conference, 'Preparing for Tomorrow Today: The First Year as Foundation', Townsville, Australia. Retrieved from http://www.fyhe.com.au/past_papers/papers09/content/pdf/1B.pdf
- Rivers, J. (Ed.). (2005). *Supporting students in tertiary study: A summary of a synthesis of research on the impact of student support services on student outcomes in undergraduate tertiary study*. Wellington, New Zealand: Ministry of Education. Retrieved from http://www.educationcounts.govt.nz/_data/assets/pdf_file/0012/7320/student-support-summary.pdf
- Rochecouste, J., Oliver, R., Mulligan, D., & Davies, M. (2010). *Addressing the ongoing English language growth of international students [Final report]*. Sydney, Australia: Australian Learning and Teaching Council. Retrieved from <http://www.altc.edu.au/project-addressing-ongoing-english-monash-2007>
- Ross, C. (c. 2008–2009). *Culturally relevant peer support for Māori and Pasifika student engagement, retention and success* [Research project carried out under the auspices of Ako Aotearoa, The National Centre for Teaching Excellence, Wellington, New Zealand]. Retrieved from the Ako Aotearoa website: <http://ako.aotearoa.ac.nz/download/ng/file/group-4/n1364-culturally-relevant-peer-support-for-mori-and-pasifika-student-engagement-retention-and-success.pdf>
- Ross, P., & Tronson, D. (2005, September). *Providing quality feedback: Where to from here?* Paper presented at the Symposium on Blended Learning in Science Teaching and Learning, Sydney, Australia. Retrieved from http://sydney.edu.au/science/uniserve_science/pubs/procs/wshop10/2005Ross.pdf
- Salter, S., Douglas, T., Pittaway, J., Swabey, K., & Capstick, M. (2010, June). *Games students play: Engaging first year tertiary students in linking and extending foundation material through the use of a digital game*. Paper presented at the 13th Pacific Rim First Year in Higher Education Conference, 'Aspiration, Access, Achievement', Adelaide, Australia. Retrieved from http://www.fyhe.com.au/past_papers/papers10/content/pdf/13C.pdf
- Sankey, M., & Lawrence, J. (2008, June). *I'm not alone: First year course leaders helped through communities of practice*. Paper presented at the 5th International Lifelong Learning Conference, 'Lifelong Learning: Reflecting on Successes and Framing Futures', Yeppoon, Australia. Available from <http://hdl.cqu.edu.au/10018/15153>
- Sanson, M. (2009, June–July). *Preparing tomorrow's lawyers today: Graduate attributes in first year law*. Paper presented at the 12th Pacific Rim First Year in Higher Education Conference, 'Preparing for Tomorrow Today: The First Year as Foundation', Townsville, Australia. Retrieved from http://www.fyhe.com.au/past_papers/papers09/content/pdf/7E.pdf
- Sawir, E., Marginson, S., Deumert, A., Nyland, C., & Ramia, G. (2008). Loneliness and international students: An Australian study. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 12(2), 148–180. doi: 10.1177/1028315307299699
- Sawyer, T., & Scutter, S. (2009, July). *Using a wiki to develop first year engagement*. Paper presented at the 32nd HERDSA Annual Conference, 'The Student Experience', Darwin, Australia. Retrieved from http://www.herdsa.org.au/wp-content/uploads/conference/2009/papers/HERDSA2009_Sawyer_T.pdf
- Schier, M., Mulvany, J., & Shaw, J. (2010, December). *Use of student audio recordings to develop communication skills in a first year physiology unit*. Paper presented at the 27th ascilite Conference, 'Curriculum, Technology and Transformation for an Unknown Future', Sydney, Australia. Retrieved from <http://www.ascilite.org.au/conferences/sydney10/Ascilite%20conference%20proceedings%202010/Schier-concise.pdf>
- Schulte, J. (2006, September). *Delivering first year physics assignments with limited resources: An Australian three-centre study*. Paper presented at the Symposium on Assessment in Science Teaching and Learning, Sydney, Australia. Retrieved from <http://science.uniserve.edu.au/pubs/procs/2006/schulte.pdf>
- Scott, C., McKain, V., & Jarman, R. (2000). The challenges and benefits of an orientation camp for first year engineering students. *Australasian Journal of Engineering Education*, 9(1), 21–38. Available from http://www.aee.com.au/journal/AJEEv9n1_2000.pdf
- Scouller, K., Bonanno, H., Smith, L., & Krass, I. (2008). Student experience and tertiary expectations: Factors predicting academic literacy amongst first-year pharmacy students. *Studies in Higher Education*, 33(2), 167–178. doi: 10.1080/03075070801916047

- Scull, S., & Cuthill, M. (2010). Engaged outreach: Using community engagement to facilitate access to higher education for people from low socio-economic backgrounds. *Higher Education Research & Development*, 29(1), 59–74. doi: 10.1080/07294360903421368
- Scutter, S., & King, S. (2010, June). *How do podcasts influence the transition to first year university study?* Paper presented at the 13th Pacific Rim First Year in Higher Education Conference, 'Aspiration, Access, Achievement', Adelaide, Australia. Retrieved from http://www.fyhe.com.au/past_papers/papers10/content/pdf/12C.pdf
- Scutter, S., & Wood, D. (2009, July). *Enhancing the first-year student learning experience through quality improvement of courses.* Paper presented at the 32nd HERDSA Annual Conference, 'The Student Experience', Darwin, Australia. Retrieved from http://www.herdsa.org.au/wp-content/uploads/conference/2009/papers/HERDSA2009_Scutter_S.pdf
- Shackelford, N., & Blickem, C. (2007). A model for language and academic skills development for first-year students of business. *Prospect*, 22(1), 72–93. Retrieved from http://www.ameprc.mq.edu.au/docs/prospect_journal/volume_22_no_1/22_1_5_Shackelford.pdf
- Shannon, S. (2006, December). *Why don't students attend lectures and what can be done about it through using iPod nanos?* Paper presented at the 23th ascilite Conference, 'Who's Learning? Whose Technology?', Sydney, Australia. Retrieved from http://www.ascilite.org.au/conferences/sydney06/proceeding/pdf_papers/p28.pdf
- Sharma, M., Mendez, A., & O'Byrne, J. (2005). The relationship between attendance in student-centred physics tutorials and performance in university examinations. *International Journal of Science Education*, 27(11), 1375–1389. doi: 10.1080/09500690500153931
- Shulman, L. (1998). Course anatomy: The dissection and analysis of knowledge through teaching. In P. Hutchings & L. Shulman (Eds.), *The course portfolio: How faculty can examine their teaching to advance practice and improve student learning* (pp. 5–12). Washington, DC: American Association for Higher Education.
- Shulruf, B., Hattie, J., & Tumen, S. (2008). The predictability of enrolment and first year university results from secondary school performance: The New Zealand National Certificate of Educational Achievement. *Studies in Higher Education*, 33(6), 685–698. doi: 10.1080/03075070802457025
- Simeoni, R. (2009, June–July). *Student retention trends within a health foundation year and implications for orientation, engagement and retention strategies.* Paper presented at the 12th Pacific Rim First Year in Higher Education Conference, 'Preparing for Tomorrow Today: The First Year as Foundation', Townsville, Australia. Retrieved from http://www.fyhe.com.au/past_papers/papers09/content/pdf/2B.pdf
- Skene, J. (2003, July). *Improving student diversity through transition support at the University of Western Australia.* Paper presented at the 7th Pacific Rim First Year in Higher Education Conference, 'Enhancing the Transition to Higher Education', Brisbane, Australia. Available from http://www.fyhe.com.au/past_papers/papers03.htm
- Skene, J., & Evamy, S. (2009, June–July). *Does access equal success? The critical role of the FYE in achieving equity in higher education.* Paper presented at the 12th Pacific Rim First Year in Higher Education Conference, 'Preparing for Tomorrow Today: The First Year as Foundation', Townsville, Australia. Retrieved from http://www.fyhe.com.au/past_papers/papers09/content/pdf/4A.pdf
- Skene, J., Hogan, J., & Brown, J. (2006, July). *Easing the transition to university study: Ideas and practice.* Paper presented at the 9th Pacific Rim First Year in Higher Education Conference, 'Engaging Students', Gold Coast, Australia. Retrieved from http://www.fyhe.com.au/past_papers/2006/Papers/Skene.pdf
- Skyrme, G. (2007). Entering the university: The differentiated experience of two Chinese international students in a New Zealand university. *Studies in Higher Education*, 32(3), 357–372. doi: 10.1080/03075070701346915
- Smith, C., Isaacs, G., Holzi, A., Herbert, D., & Roulston, K. (2000, July). *The first cohort at a new campus: Who are they? What do they bring? Where are they going? Why did they come?* Paper presented at the ASET/HERDSA Joint International Conference, 'Flexible Learning for a Flexible Society', Toowoomba, Australia. Retrieved from <http://www.ascilite.org.au/aset-archives/conf/aset-herdsa2000/procs/smith1.html>
- Smith, E. (2010, June). *StudyLink: A case study of an enabling program supporting the transition to the first year of university.* Paper presented at the 13th Pacific Rim First Year in Higher Education Conference, 'Aspiration, Access, Achievement', Adelaide, Australia. Retrieved from http://www.fyhe.com.au/past_papers/papers10/content/pdf/4A.pdf

- Snepvangers, K., & Yorke, A. (2002, December). *Transition 101: Technology, engagement and the art of conversation in first-year art and design education*. Paper presented at the Australian Association for Research in Education Annual Conference, Brisbane, Australia. Retrieved from <http://www.aare.edu.au/02pap/sne02478.htm>
- Speilberger, C., Gorsuch, R., Lushene, P., Vagg, P., & Jacobs, A. (1983). *Manual for the State-Trait Anxiety Inventory (Form Y)*. Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press.
- Stanley, D., & Lapsley, J. (2008). Student mentors: Supporting new-to-course transition. *Journal of the Australian and New Zealand Student Services Association*, 32, 46–60. Available from <http://www.adcet.edu.au/Anzssa/View.aspx?id=7399>
- Star, C., & McDonald, J. (2007). Embedding successful pedagogical practices: Assessment strategies for a large diverse, first year student cohort. *International Journal of Pedagogies and Learning*, 3(2), 18–30. Retrieved from http://eprints.usq.edu.au/3466/1/Star_McDonald.pdf
- Stone, C. (2000). The S.O.S. Program (Student for Other Students): A student mentor program. *Journal of the Australian and New Zealand Student Services Association*, 16, 55–75. Available from <http://www.adcet.edu.au/anzssa/View.aspx?id=7419>
- Stone, C. (2005). Promoting an integrated campus-wide approach to first year student retention. *Journal of the Australian and New Zealand Student Services Association*, 26, 33–40. Available from <http://www.adcet.edu.au/Anzssa/view.aspx?id=7413>
- Strauss, P., & U, A. (2007). Group assessments: Dilemmas facing lecturers in multicultural tertiary classrooms. *Higher Education Research & Development*, 26(2), 147–161. doi: 10.1080/07294360701310789
- Stupans, I., Albrecht, T., Coffee, J., Elliot, E., Giles, E., King, S., ... Ward, H. (2009, October). *Classroom practices: Engaging the first year university student in "the novel" practical experience*. Paper presented at the Uniserve Science Conference, 'Motivating Science Undergraduates: Ideas and Interventions', Sydney, Australia. Retrieved from http://science.uniserve.edu.au/images/content/2009_papers/stupans.pdf
- Sturgess, P., & Kennedy, M. (2004). DE mentor: The challenge of supporting distance learners. *Studies in Learning, Evaluation, Innovation and Development*, 1(2), 53–60.
- Surjan, Y., Chiarelli, P., Dempsey, S., Lyall, D., O'Toole, G., Snodgrass, S., & Tessier, J. (2010). The experience of implementing an interprofessional first year course for undergraduate health science students: The value of acting on student feedback. *Journal of University Teaching & Learning Practice*, 7(1). Available from <http://ro.uow.edu.au/jutlp/vol7/iss1/5>
- Swing, R. (2003, June–July). *First-year student success: In search of best practice*. Keynote address presented at the 7th Pacific Rim First Year in Higher Education Conference, 'Enhancing Transition to Higher Education: Strategies and Policies that Work', Brisbane, Australia. Available from http://www.fyhe.com.au/past_papers/keynote2.htm
- Syron, M., & McLaughlin, J. (2010, June). *Indigenous knowledges: Informing and supporting Indigenous students during their first year at university*. Paper presented at the 13th Pacific Rim First Year in Higher Education Conference, 'Aspiration, Access, Achievement', Adelaide, Australia. Retrieved from http://www.fyhe.com.au/past_papers/papers10/content/pdf/13A.pdf
- Taylor, J. (2008). Assessment in first year university: A model to manage transition. *Journal of University Teaching & Learning Practice*, 5(1). Available from <http://ro.uow.edu.au/jutlp/vol5/iss1/3>
- Taylor, P., Millwater, J., & Nash, R. (2007, July). *Talking about transitions: The value of a conceptual approach*. Paper presented at the 30th HERDSA Annual Conference, 'Enhancing Higher Education, Theory and Scholarship', Adelaide, Australia. Retrieved from <http://www.herdsa.org.au/wp-content/uploads/conference/2007/PDF/REF/p167.pdf>
- Taylor, P., Pillay, H., & Clarke, J. (2004). Exploring student adaption to new learning environments: Some unexpected outcomes. *International Journal of Learning Technology*, 1(1), 100–110. doi: 10.1504/IJLT.2004.003684
- Tchen, G., Carter, A., Gibbons, P., & McLaughlin, P. (2001). What is the relationship between indicators of stress and academic performance in first year university students? A prospective study. *Journal of Institutional Research*, 10(2), 1–12. Available from <http://www.aair.org.au/journal/volume-10-no-2>

- Teakle, N. (2008, January). *Problem based learning for first year students: Perspectives from students and laboratory demonstrators*. Paper presented at the 17th annual Teaching and Learning Forum, 'Preparing for the Graduate of 2015', Perth, Australia. Retrieved from <http://otl.curtin.edu.au/tlf/tlf2008/refereed/teakle.html>
- The Quality Assurance Agency for Higher Education Scotland. (2008). *Quality enhancement themes. First Year: Engagement and empowerment*. Glasgow, United Kingdom: Author. Retrieved from <http://www.enhancementthemes.ac.uk/themes/FiratYear/default.asp>
- Thiele, M. (2008, December). *A tool to help students manage study time*. Paper presented at the 19th annual Australasian Association for Engineering Education Conference, 'To industry and beyond', Yeppoon, Australia. Retrieved from http://aaee.com.au/conferences/papers/2008/aaee08_submission_M1C4.pdf
- Thompson, G., Pilgrim, A., & Oliver, K. (2005). Self-assessment and reflective learning for first-year university geography students: A simple guide or simply misguided? *Journal of Geography in Higher Education*, 29(3), 403–420. doi: 10.1080/03098260500290959
- Tinto, V. (2006–2007). Research and practice of student retention: What next? *Journal of College Student Retention*, 8(1), 1–19.
- Tinto, V. (2009, February). *Taking student retention seriously: Rethinking the first year of university*. Keynote address presented at the FYE Curriculum Design Symposium, 'Articulating a Transition Pedagogy', Brisbane, Australia. Available from <http://www.fyecd2009.qut.edu.au/resources>
- Todd, N., & Ballantyne, J. (2007, July). *'This is our campus!' Student perspectives of their 1st year experience at a new university campus*. Paper presented at the 10th Pacific Rim First Year in Higher Education Conference, 'Engage, Regenerate, Experiment', Brisbane, Australia. Retrieved from http://www.fyhe.qut.edu.au/past_papers/papers07/final_papers/pdfs/3e.pdf
- Truvert, T. (2010, June). *Enhancing learning experiences to improve outcomes through sessional tutor conceptual expansion*. Paper presented at the 13th Pacific Rim First Year in Higher Education Conference, 'Aspiration, Access, Achievement', Adelaide, Australia. Retrieved from http://www.fyhe.com.au/past_papers/papers10/content/pdf/12A.pdf
- van der Meer, J., Jansen, E., & Torenbeek, M. (2010). 'It's almost a mindset that teachers need to change': First-year students' need to be inducted into time management. *Studies in Higher Education*, 35(7), 777–791. doi: 10.1080/03075070903383211
- van der Meer, J., & Scott, C. (2008). Shifting the balance in first-year learning support: From staff instruction to peer-learning primacy. *Australasian Journal of Peer Learning*, 1(1), 70–79.
- van der Meer, J., & Scott, C. (2009, June–July). *Strategically enhancing student engagement in the first year: Focusing on sustainable interventions*. Paper presented at the 12th Pacific Rim First Year in Higher Education Conference, 'Preparing for Tomorrow Today: The First Year as Foundation', Townsville, Australia. Retrieved from http://www.fyhe.com.au/past_papers/papers09/content/pdf/9A.pdf
- van der Meer, J., Scott, S., & Neha, T. (2010). Retention of first-year Māori students at university. *MAI Review*, 2. Available at <http://www.review.mai.ac.nz/index.php/MR/article/view/309/466>
- van Rensburg, B., Danaher, P., & van Rensburg, H. (2010, June). *Managing the expectations–reality mismatch through aspirations, access and achievement: Engineering a first year undergraduate student's habitus*. Paper presented at the 13th Pacific Rim First Year in Higher Education Conference, 'Aspiration, Access, Achievement', Adelaide, Australia. Retrieved from http://www.fyhe.com.au/past_papers/papers10/content/pdf/9E.pdf
- Vardi, I. (2000, July). *What lecturers' want: An investigation of lecturers' expectations in first year essay writing tasks*. Paper presented at the 4th Pacific Rim First Year in Higher Education Conference, 'Creating Futures for a New Millennium', Brisbane, Australia. Available from http://www.fyhe.com.au/past_papers/abstracts/VardiAbstract.htm
- Wahr, F., Gray, K., & Radloff, A. (2009, July). *Improving student transition by working with academics' conceptions of the student experience: Academic development for organisational change*. Paper presented at the 32nd HERDSA Annual Conference, 'The Student Experience', Darwin, Australia. Retrieved from http://www.herdsa.org.au/newsite/wp/wp-content/uploads/conference/2009/papers/HERDSA2009_Wahr_F.pdf
- Walck, D., & Hensby, S. (2003). Career and degree choice at transition to university. *Australian Journal of Career Development*, 12(3), 64–71.

- Walker, K. (2001). The concerns of commencing students at Adelaide University. *Journal of the Australian and New Zealand Student Services Association*, 18, 20–39. Available from <http://www.adcet.edu.au/anzssa/View.aspx?id=7418>
- Walker, L. (2010, December). *Quantifying the benefits of narrated screen capture videos*. Paper presented at the 27th ascilite Conference, 'Curriculum, Technology and Transformation for an Unknown Future', Sydney, Australia. Retrieved from <http://www.ascilite.org.au/conferences/sydney10/Ascilite%20conference%20proceedings%202010/Walker-concise.pdf>
- Walker, R. [Ranginui]. (2005). *Quality assurance in tertiary education from a Māori (Indigenous) perspective*. Retrieved from the World Indigenous Consortium on Higher Education (WINHEC) website: <http://www.win-hec.org/docs/pdfs/Journal/Ranginui%20Walker.pdf>
- Walker, R. [Rebecca]., Spronken-Smith, R., Bond, C., McDonald, F., Reynolds, J., & McMartin, A. (2010). The impact of curriculum change on health sciences first year students' approaches to learning. *Instructional Science*, 38(6), 707–722. doi: 10.1007/s11251-009-9092-y
- Waters, D. (2004, July). *Systematising enhancement of the first-year experience: A project informed by factors affecting first-year attrition*. Paper presented at the 8th Pacific Rim First Year in Higher Education Conference, 'Dealing with Diversity', Melbourne, Australia. Available from http://www.fyhe.com.au/past_papers/papers04.htm
- Waycott, J., & Kennedy, G. (2009, December). *Mobile and Web 2.0 technologies in undergraduate science: Situating learning in everyday experience*. Paper presented at the 26th ascilite Conference, 'Same Places, Different Spaces', Auckland, New Zealand. Retrieved from <http://www.ascilite.org.au/conferences/auckland09/procs/waycott.pdf>
- Wells, I., Kift, S., & Field, R. (2008, June–July). *FYE2: Recognising and acting on the synergies between the first and final year experiences in legal education*. Paper presented at the 11th Pacific Rim First Year in Higher Education Conference, 'An Apple for the Learner: Celebrating the First Year Experience', Hobart, Australia. Retrieved from http://www.fyhe.com.au/past_papers/papers08/FYHE2008/content/pdfs/6E.pdf
- Werth, S., Southey, K., & Lynch, B. (2009). Catching them is one thing, keeping them is something else. Reflections on teaching first year students. *Studies in Learning, Evaluation, Innovation and Development*, 6(1), 30–37.
- West, R. (1998). *Learning for life: Review of higher education financing and policy*. Canberra, Australia: Australian Government.
- White, F. (2009, June–July). *Successful outcomes for Māori first-year students: A work in progress*. Paper presented at the 12th Pacific Rim First Year in Higher Education Conference, 'Preparing for Tomorrow Today: The First Year as Foundation', Townsville, Australia. Retrieved from http://www.fyhe.com.au/past_papers/papers09/content/pdf/4B.pdf
- White, R. (2010, June). *Integrated learning engineering – Taking first year engineering into secondary schools*. Paper presented at the 13th Pacific Rim First Year in Higher Education Conference, 'Aspiration, Access, Achievement', Adelaide, Australia. Retrieved from http://www.fyhe.com.au/past_papers/papers10/content/pdf/6F.pdf
- Whittington, V., & Thompson, C. (2010, June). 'It was all too much.' *The vulnerability of vocational education entrants in their first year of Bachelor of Early Childhood Education studies*. Paper presented at the 13th Pacific Rim First Year in Higher Education Conference, 'Aspiration, Access, Achievement', Adelaide, Australia. Retrieved from http://www.fyhe.com.au/past_papers/papers10/content/pdf/5F.pdf
- Willcoxson, L. (2010). Factors affecting intention to leave in the first, second and third year of university studies: A semester-by-semester investigation. *Higher Education Research & Development*, 29(6), 623–639. doi: 10.1080/07294360.2010.501071
- Williams, A., & Sher, W. (2007, December). *Using Blackboard to monitor and support first year engineering students*. Paper presented at the 18th annual Australasian Association for Engineering Education Conference, Melbourne, Australia. Retrieved from http://www.cs.mu.oz.au/aaee2007/papers/paper_34.pdf
- Wilson, K. (2009, June–July). *The impact of institutional, programmatic and personal interventions on an effective and sustainable first-year student experience*. Keynote address presented at the 12th Pacific Rim First Year in Higher Education Conference, 'Preparing for Tomorrow Today: The First Year as Foundation', Townsville, Australia. Retrieved from http://www.fyhe.com.au/past_papers/papers09/ppts/Keithia_Wilson_paper.pdf

- Wilson, K., & Lizzio, A. (2008, June–July). A 'just in time intervention' to support the academic efficacy of at-risk first-year students. Paper presented at the 11th Pacific Rim First Year in Higher Education Conference, 'An Apple for the Learner: Celebrating the First Year Experience', Hobart, Australia. Retrieved from http://www.fyhe.com.au/past_papers/papers08/FYHE2008/content/pdfs/6b.pdf
- Wilson, S. (2007, July). A staff-centred approach to enhancing first year learning and teaching at the University of New South Wales. Paper presented at the 10th Pacific Rim First Year in Higher Education Conference, 'Engage, Regenerate, Experiment', Brisbane, Australia. Retrieved from http://www.fyhe.qut.edu.au/past_papers/papers07/final_papers/pdfs/6b.pdf
- Winning, T., Lekkas, D., & Townsend, G. (2007, July). Supporting undergraduate dental students to become effective self-assessors in clinical settings. Paper presented at the 30th HERDSA Annual Conference, 'Enhancing Higher Education, Theory and Scholarship', Adelaide, Australia. Retrieved from <http://www.herdsa.org.au/wp-content/uploads/conference/2007/PDF/REF/p245.pdf>
- Wood, D. (2009, December). Experiential learning through 'real world' placements undertaken in 3D 'virtual world' spaces. Paper presented at the 26th ascilite Conference, 'Same Places, Different Spaces', Auckland, New Zealand. Retrieved from <http://www.ascilite.org.au/conferences/auckland09/procs/wood.pdf>
- Wood, D. (2010). Transforming the first year learning experience through research based media practice. *International Journal of the First Year in Higher Education*, 1(1), 31–42. doi: 10.5204/intjfyhe.v1i1.21
- Wood, G., & Petocz, P. (2008). One in a million: An alternative transformation of the first-year statistics course. *Asian Social Science*, 4(3), 43–47. Available from <http://www.ccsenet.org/journal/index.php/ass/article/view/1967>
- Woodbridge, S., & Osmond, J. (2009). Transition and retention in human services: An exploratory study of the first year. *Journal of the Australian and New Zealand Student Services Association*, 33, 4–26. Available from <http://www.adcet.edu.au/anzssa/View.aspx?id=7431>
- Wright, S. (2010). Course diversity within South Australian secondary schools as a factor of successful transition and retention within Australian universities. *International Journal of the First Year in Higher Education*, 1(1), 21–30. doi: 10.5204/intjfyhe.v1i1.16
- Wylie, J. (2005, December). *Improving student persistence outcomes in higher education: A theoretical model for an institution-wide retention plan*. Paper presented at the Australian Association for Research in Education Annual Conference, Melbourne, Australia. Retrieved from <http://www.aare.edu.au/05pap/wyl05438.pdf>
- Yeo, A., & Zadnik, M. (2004, July). *Students' responses to different first year science learning environments*. Paper presented at the 27th HERDSA Annual Conference, 'Transforming Knowledge into Wisdom: Holistic Approaches to Teaching and Learning', Miri, Sarawak. Retrieved from <http://www.herdsa.org.au/wp-content/uploads/conference/2004/papers/yeo.pdf>
- Yeo, S. (2006, September). *Science and engineering students' beliefs about plagiarism: 'It's only an assignment'*. Paper presented at the Symposium on Assessment in Science Teaching and Learning, Sydney, Australia. Retrieved from <http://science.uniserve.edu.au/pubs/procs/2006/yeo.pdf>
- Yeo, S. (2007). First-year university science and engineering students' understanding of plagiarism. *Higher Education Research & Development*, 26(2), 199–216. doi: 10.1080/07294360701310813
- Yeung, A., Read, J., & Schmid, S. (2005, September). *Students' learning styles and academic performance in first year chemistry*. Paper presented at the Symposium on Blended Learning in Science Teaching and Learning, Sydney, Australia. Retrieved from <http://science.uniserve.edu.au/pubs/procs/wshop10/2005Yeung.pdf>
- Yorke, M. (2006, July). *Student engagement: Deep, surface or strategic?* Keynote address presented at the 9th Pacific Rim First Year in Higher Education Conference, 'Engaging Students', Gold Coast, Australia. Retrieved from http://www.fyhe.com.au/past_papers/2006/Keynotes/Yorke.pdf
- Yorke, M., & Longden, B. (2004). *Retention and student success in higher education*. Maidenhead, United Kingdom: Society for Research into Higher Education and Open University Press.
- Yorke, M., & Longden, B. (2008). *The first-year experience of higher education in the UK* [Final report of a project funded by the Higher Education Academy]. York, United Kingdom: Higher Education Academy. Available from http://www.heacademy.ac.uk/news/detail/fye_final_report

- Zeegers, P., & Martin, L. (2001). A learning-to-learn program in a first-year chemistry class. *Higher Education Research & Development*, 20(1), 35–52. doi: 10.1080/07924360120043630
- Zeeng, L., Robbie, D., Markham-Adams, K., & Hutchison, C. (2009, December). *Where's my class? Using Web 2.0 for collaboration in a design environment*. Paper presented at the 26th ascilite Conference, 'Same Places, Different Spaces', Auckland, New Zealand. Retrieved from <http://www.ascilite.org.au/conferences/auckland09/procs/zeeng.pdf>
- Zepke, N., & Leach, L. (2005). Integration and adaptation: Approaches to the student retention and achievement puzzle. *Active learning in Higher Education*, 6(1), 46–59. doi: 10.1177/1469787405049946
- Zepke, N., & Leach, L. (2007). Improving student outcomes in higher education: New Zealand teachers' views on teaching students from diverse backgrounds. *Teaching in Higher Education*, 12(5–6), 655–668. doi: 10.1080/13562510701596190
- Zepke, N., & Leach, L. (2010a). *Improving student engagement in post-compulsory education: A synthesis of research literature* [Report]. Wellington, New Zealand: Teaching and Learning Research Initiative. Retrieved from http://www.tlri.org.nz/assets/A_Project-PDFs/9261-Zepke/9261-Literature-review.pdf
- Zepke, N., & Leach, L. (2010b). Improving student engagement: Ten proposals for action. *Active Learning in Higher Education*, 11(3), 167–177. doi: 10.1177/1469787410379680
- Zepke, N., Leach, L., & Butler, P. (2010). Engagement in post-compulsory education: Students' motivation and action. *Research in Post-Compulsory Education*, 15(1), 1–17. doi: 10.1080/13596740903565269
- Zepke, N., Leach, L., & Prebble, T. (2006). Being learner centred: One way to improve student retention? *Studies in Higher Education*, 31(5), 587–600. doi: 10.1080/03075070600923418
- Zepke, N., Leach, L., Prebble, T., Campbell, A., Coltman, D., Dewart, B., ... Wilson, S. (2005). *Improving tertiary student outcomes in the first year of study* [Report]. Wellington, New Zealand: Teaching and Learning Research Initiative. Available from <http://www.tlri.org.nz/improving-tertiary-student-outcomes-their-first-year-study>
- Zhang, F., Lidbury, B., Schulte, J., Bridgeman, A., Yates, B., & Rodger, J. (2010, June). *Catering for the language needs of diverse first year science students*. Paper presented at the 13th Pacific Rim First Year in Higher Education Conference, 'Aspiration, Access, Achievement', Adelaide, Australia. Retrieved from http://www.fyhe.com.au/past_papers/papers10/content/pdf/3C.pdf
- Zimitat, C. (2003, July). *The impact of full-time employment and family commitments on the first year experience of full-time students*. Paper presented at the 7th Pacific Rim First Year in Higher Education Conference, 'Enhancing the Transition to Higher Education', Brisbane, Australia. Retrieved from <http://www.gu.edu.au/landt/studentretention/FYConferenceJuly2003.pdf>
- Zimitat, C. (2006, July). *Improving quality of teaching is part of improving retention: A study of first year students in an Australian university*. Paper presented at the 9th Pacific Rim First Year in Higher Education Conference, 'Engaging Students', Gold Coast, Australia. Retrieved from http://www.fyhe.com.au/past_papers/2006/Papers/Zimitat.pdf
- Zimitat, C., & Sebastian, D. (2007, July). *The first year experience on an outer metropolitan campus*. Paper presented at the 10th Pacific Rim First Year in Higher Education Conference, 'Engage, Regenerate, Experiment', Brisbane, Australia. Retrieved from http://www.fyhe.qut.edu.au/past_papers/papers07/final_papers/pdfs/8c.pdf

Downloaded Copy



Appendix 1: Source of literature items

This appendix contains the following information:

- A list of the items of literature reviewed. This is in an *author(s)–year of publication* format. Full bibliographic details are available in the References section
- Acronyms for the conferences, journals and reports that were the sources of the items reviewed
- A series of tables indicating, for each item of literature reviewed, the year and specific source of the item.

Reviewed items in author(s)–year format

- Adam, A., Hartigan, C., & Brown, N. (2010).
- Adams, P., Alcock, J., Bulmer, M., Grotowski, J., Hong, M-C., Jennings, N., Miller, M., O'Brien, M., & Scharaschkin, V. (2008).
- Airini, Brown, D., Curtis, E., Johnson, O., Luatua, F., O'Shea, M., Rakena, T. O., Reynolds, G., Sauni, P., Smith, A., Su'a Huirua, T., Tarawa, M., Townsend, S., & Ulugia-Pua, M. (2010).
- Ali, S., & Lockstone, L. (2006).
- Allen, B., Crosky, A., McAlpine, I., Hoffman, M., & Munroe, P. (2006).
- Anderson, J., & McCrea, N. (2005).
- Andrews, C. (2006).
- Arkoudis, S., Yu, X., Baik, C., Borland, H., Chang, S., Lang, I., Lang, J., Pearce, A., & Watty, K. (2010).
- Armstrong, S., Campbell, M., & Brogan, M. (2009).
- Asmar, C., & Peseta, T. (2001).
- Australasian Survey of Student Engagement. (2008).
- Australasian Survey of Student Engagement. (2009).
- Australasian Survey of Student Engagement. (2010).
- Australian Council for Educational Research. (2008).
- Australian Council for Educational Research. (2009).
- Australian Government Department Education, Employment and Workplace Relations. (2009).
- Australian Government Department of Education, Science and Training. (2004).
- Australian Learning and Teaching Council. (2008).
- Australian Learning and Teaching Council. (2009a).
- Australian Learning and Teaching Council. (2009b).
- Australian Learning and Teaching Council. (2010).
- Bagot, K., Lindley, J., Vance, S., Liddell, M., Davidson, S., Story, M., Hodgson, W., & Lewenberg, M. (2004).
- Baker, K., Barrington, F., Gleeson, D., Livett, M., & McFadyen, D. (2002).
- Ballantyne, C. (2000).
- Ballantyne, J., Todd, N., & Olm, T. (2007).
- Bambrick, S. (2002).
- Bamforth, C. (2010).
- Barker, G. (2000).
- Bath, D., & Bourke, J. (2010).
- Bellette, M. (2005).
- Benckendorff, P. (2009).
- Benseman, J., Coxon, E., Anderson, H., & Anae, M. (2006).
- Biggs, J. (1987).
- Birch, E., & Miller, P. (2006).
- Bird, F. (2006).
- Blanksby, T., & Chan, C. (2006).
- Blunden, R. (2002).
- Bolitho, R. (2001).
- Bonanno, H. (2002).
- Boyd, J., & Lintern, S. (2006).
- Boyd, W., O'Reilly, M., Bucher, D., Fisher, K., Morton, A., Harrison, P., Nuske, E., Coyle, R., & Rendall, K. (2010).
- Brack, C., & Van Damme, M-P. (2010).
- Bradley, D., Noonan, P., Nugent, H., & Scales, B. (2008).
- Brett, M., & Kavanagh, L. (2007).
- Bridges, W. (2003).

- Brinkworth, R., McCann, B., Matthews, C., & Nordström, K. (2009).
- Britton, S., New, P., Sharma, M., & Yardley, D. (2005).
- Bronfenbrenner, U. (1976).
- Brown, N., & Adam, A. (2009).
- Brown, N., Adam, A., Douglas, R., & Skalicky, J. (2009).
- Brownlee, J., Walker, S., Lennox, S., Exley, B., & Pearce, S. (2009).
- Budge, K. (2010).
- Buissink-Smith, N., Spronken-Smith, R., & Walker, R. (2010).
- Bull, D. (2000).
- Burke da Silva, K., & Auburn, Z. (2009).
- Burnett, L., & Larmar, S. (2008).
- Burton, K., & Cuffe, N. (2005).
- Burton, L., Taylor, J., Dowling, D., & Lawrence, J. (2009).
- Calder, A. (2000).
- Calder, A. (2004).
- Cameron, H., & Tesoriero, F. (2003).
- Cameron, H., & Tesoriero, F. (2004).
- Carlson, G., Scarbrough, J., & Carlson, J. (2009).
- Carmichael, E. (2003).
- Carr, R., Hagel, P., & Hellier, P. (2010).
- Chu, H., Treagust, D., & Chandrasegaran, A. (2008).
- Clark, J. (2009).
- Clark, W. (2009).
- Clerehan, R. (2002).
- Clerehan, R., & Walker, I. (2003).
- Clulow, V. (2000).
- Coffee, J. (2007).
- Corbin, J., & Karasmanis, S. (2010).
- Crisp, G., Palmer, E., Turnbull, D., Nettelbeck, T., Ward, L., LeCouteur, A., Sarris, A., Strelan, P., & Schneider, L. (2009).
- Crosling, G. (2003).
- Crosling, G., Heagney, M., & Thomas, L. (2009).
- Crosthwaite, C., & Churchward, G. (2000).
- Crowther, P. (2010).
- Cullen, M. (2006).
- Cullen, M. (2007).
- Curtis, B., Hefley, W., & Miller, S. (2009).
- Dancer, D., & Fiebig, D. (2000).
- Dancer, D., & Kamvounias, P. (2008).
- Dane, J. (2010).
- Darab, S. (2006).
- Darlaston-Jones, D., Cohen, L., Drew, N., Haunold, S., Pike, L., & Young, A. (2001).
- Darlaston-Jones, D., Cohen, L., Haunold, S., Pike, L., Young, A., & Drew, N. (2003).
- Darroch, A., & Rainsbury, E. (2009).
- Dawson, P., Lockyer, L., & Ferry, B. (2007).
- De Clercq, L., Pearson, S., & Rolfe, I. (2001).
- Devlin, M. (2008).
- Devlin, M. (2009).
- Devlin, M. (2010).
- Di Corpo, S. (2009).
- Dobozy, E., & Pospisil, R. (2008).
- Donnison, S., Edwards, D., Itter, D., Martin, D., & Yager, Z. (2009).
- Donnison, S., & Masters, J. (2010).
- Doring, A., Bingham, B., & Bramwell-Vial, A. (2001).
- Douglass, L., & Islam, M. (2009).
- Duff, A., Quinn, D., Johnston, H., & Lock, P. (2007).
- Duncan, M., Quinn, C., Nelson, K., Smith, J., Creagh, T., & Clarke, J. (2009).
- Edwards, A. (2010).
- Eijkman, H. (2002).
- Elder, C., Erlam, R., & von Randow, J. (2002).
- Elliott, A. (2002).
- Elliot, J. (2000).
- Ellis, J., & Salisbury, F. (2004).
- Ellis, N. (2010).
- Ellis, R., Taylor, C., & Drury, H. (2007).
- Emerson, L., MacKay, B., & Rees, M. (2006).
- Emmitt, M., Callaghan, V., Warren, W., & Postill, K. (2002).
- Exeter, D., Ameratunga, S., Ratima, M., Morton, S., Dickson, M., Hsu, D., & Jackson, R. (2010).
- Farrington, S., Page, S., & DiGregorio, K. (2001).
- Field, R., & Kift, S. (2010).
- Fisher, R., McPhail, R., & McConachie, J. (2009).
- Forret, M., Eames, C., Coll, R., Campbell, A., Cronje, T., Stewart, K., Dodd, D., Stonyer, H., Clarke, J., Maclean, C., Kunzemeyer, R., & Prinsep, M. (2007).
- Foster, G. (2010).
- Fowler, J. (2004).
- Gale, T. (2009).
- Gale, T., & Tranter, D. (2011).
- Game, A., & Metcalfe, A. (2009).
- Gibson-van Marrewijk, K., Hipkins, R., Stewart, J., Dannenfeldt, G., Stewart, K., & McHaffie, J. (2008).
- Glaser, N., Hall, R., & Halperin, S. (2006).
- Godfrey, E. (2008).
- Griffin, T., Gilchrist, A., & Thomson, R. (2009).
- Griffin, T., & Thomson, R. (2008).
- Grob, G. (2000).

- Groen, L., & Carmody, G. (2005).
- Gross, J., & Dobozy, E. (2009).
- Hamlett, B. (2010).
- Harvey, L., Drew, S., & Smith, M. (2006).
- Hatsidimitris, G., & Wolfe, J. (2007).
- Henderson, R., Noble, K., & De George-Walker, L. (2009).
- Higher Education Academy. (2001).
- Hillman, K., & McMillan, J. (2005).
- Holden, H. (2005).
- Horstmanshof, L., & Zimitat, C. (2003a).
- Horstmanshof, L., & Zimitat, C. (2003b).
- Howells, K. (2003).
- Huijser, H., & Kimmins, L. (2005).
- Humphrey, W. (1989).
- Hunter, S., & Linder, C. (2005).
- Huntly, H., & Donovan, J. (2009).
- Jackling, B., & Natoli, R. (2010).
- James, R. (2002).
- James, R., Baldwin, G., Coates, H., Krause, K-L., & McInnis, C. (2004).
- James, R., Baldwin, G., & McInnis, C. (1999).
- James, R., Bexley, E., Devlin, M., & Marginson, S. (2007).
- James, R., Krause, K-L., & Jennings, C. (2010).
- James, R., McInnis, C., & Devlin, M. (2002).
- Jane, B. (2002).
- Jardine, A. (2005).
- Jarkey, N. (2004).
- John N. Gardner Institute for Excellence in Undergraduate Education. (2005).
- Johnson, E. (2008).
- Johnston, C. (2001).
- Johnston, H., Duff, A., & Quinn, D. (2009).
- Jorgensen, L., Gordon, B., & Slater, G. (2001).
- Kantanis, T. (2000a).
- Kantanis, T. (2000b).
- Kantanis, T. (2002).
- Kazlauskas, A., Gimel, S., Thornton, L., Thomas, T., & Davis, T. (2007).
- Kearney, J., & Donaghy, M. (2010).
- Kennedy, G., Dalgarno, B., Bennett, S., Judd, T., Gray, K., & Chang, R. (2008).
- Kennedy, G., Krause, K-L., Maton, K., Bishop, A., Chang, R., Waycott, J., Judd, T., Gray, K., Bennett, S., & Dalgarno, B. (2009).
- Kerr, R., & Amirthalingam, V. (2010).
- Kidman, J., & Stevens, K. (2009).
- Kift, S. (2002).
- Kift, S. (2003).
- Kift, S. (2004).
- Kift, S. (2007).
- Kift, S. (2008).
- Kift, S. (2009a).
- Kift, S. (2009b).
- Kift, S. (2009c).
- Kift, S., & Field, R. (2009).
- Kift, S., & Moody, K. (2009).
- Kift, S., & Nelson, K. (2005).
- Kift, S., Nelson, K., & Clarke, J. (2010).
- Kinnear, A., Boyce, M., Sparrow, H., Middleton, S., & Cullity, M. (2009).
- Kirby, D., Dluzewska, T., & Andrews, L. (2009).
- Kirkness, A., Neill, L., & Naidoo, K. (2007).
- Knewstubb, B., & Bond, C. (2009).
- Kochikar, V. (2002).
- Koppi, T., Nolan, E., & Field, D. (2010).
- Krause, K-L. (2001).
- Krause, K-L., & Coates, H. (2008).
- Krause, K-L., & Duchesne, S. (2000).
- Krause, K-L., Harris, K-L., Garnett, R., Gleeson, D., Peat, M., & Taylor, C. (2007).
- Krause, K-L., Hartley, R., James, R., & McInnis, C. (2005).
- Krause, K-L., & McEwen, C. (2009).
- Kuh, G. (2007).
- Larcombe, W., & Malkin, I. (2008).
- Lawrence, J. (2001).
- Lawrence, J. (2002).
- Lawrence, J. (2003).
- Lawrence, J. (2005).
- Lawrence, J., Loch, B., & Galligan, L. (2010).
- Leach, L., & Zepke, N. (2010).
- Levin, E. (2001).
- Levin, E., & Tempone, I. (2002).
- Levy, S., & Murray, J. (2002).
- Levy, S., & Murray, J. (2003).
- Lewis, D., O'Brien, M., Rogan, S., & Shorten, B. (2005).
- Lilje, O., & Peat, M. (2010).
- Lintern, S., Johnston, H., & O'Regan, K. (2001).
- Lizzio, A. (2006).
- Lizzio, A., & Wilson, K. (2004).
- Long, M., Ferrier, F., & Heagney, M. (2006).
- Lu, J., Yao, J., Chin, K-L., XIAO, J., & Xu, J. (2010).
- Lupton, M. (2008).
- Luzeckyj, A., Burke da Silva, K., Scutter, S., Palmer, E., & Brinkworth, R. (2010).
- Lynch, G., & Paasuke, P. (2010).
- Macdonald, I. (2000).
- MacGillivray, H., & Wilson, T. (2008).
- Macken, C. (2009).
- Macken, C. (2010).
- MacPherson, K. (2002).
- Madigan, V. (2006).

- Maldoni, A., Kennelly, R., & Davies, D. (2007).
Male, S., & Lawrence, W. (2002).
Mandel, R., Harper, J., Moore, D., & Addinsall, M. (2005).
Marrington, A., Nelson, K., & Clarke, J. (2010).
Marshall, S., & Mitchell, G. (2007).
Martin-Lynch, P. (2010).
Mason-Rogers, C. (2002).
Matthews, K., Adams, P., & Gannaway, D. (2009).
Matthews, K., Moni, R. W., & Moni, K. B. (2010).
McAlpine, I., Reidsema, C., & Allen, B. (2006).
McCarthy, J. (2009).
McCreery, C. (2005).
McGowan, U. (2003).
McInnis, C. (2001).
McInnis, C., Hartley, R., Polesel, J., & Teese, R. (2000).
McInnis, C., James, R., & Hartley, R. (2000).
McInnis, C., James, R., & McNaught, C. (1995).
McKauge, L., Emmerton, L., Bond, J., Steadman, K., Green, W., Sweep, T., & Cole, M. (2009).
McKenzie, K., Gow, K., & Schweitzer, R. (2004).
McKenzie, K., & Schweitzer, R. (2001).
McLaughlin, M. (2003).
McLaughlin, P., & Mills, A. (2009).
McLennan, T., & Gibbs, S. (2008).
McLeod, S. (2005).
McLoughlin, C. (2002).
McNamara, J., Field, R., & Brown, C. (2009).
McNamara, L. (2000).
McPhail, R., Fisher, R., & McConachie, J. (2009).
Meyer, J., & Shanahan, M. (2001).
Meyer, J., & Shanahan, M. P. (2004).
Miller, K., Calder, C., Martin, A., McIntyre, M., Pottinger, I., & Smyth, G. (2008).
Miller, V., Oldfield, E., & Bulmer, M. (2004).
Mir, M., & Rahaman, A. (2007).
Moffat, A., Hughes, B., Sondergaard, H., & Gruba, P. (2005).
Moir, J. (2010).
Morda, R., Sonn, C., Ali, L., & Ohtsuka, K. (2007).
Morgan, D. (2003).
Morgan, S. (2009).
Morris, M., Porter, A., & Griffiths, D. (2004).
Morrison, A. (2000).
Muckert, T. (2002).
Muldoon, N., & Lee, C. (2005).
Muldoon, R. (2003).
Muldoon, R., & Macdonald, I. (2009).
Murphy, T., Edlin, A., Everiss, L., McClew, J., Margrain, V., & Meade, A. (2006).
Murray, N. (2010).
Nash, S. (2009).
Nelson, B. (2002).
Nelson, B. (2003).
Nelson, K. (2009).
Nelson, K., & Clarke, J. (2011).
Nelson, K., Creagh, T., Kift, S., & Clarke, J. (2010).
Nelson, K., Duncan, M., & Clarke, J. (2009).
Nelson, K., Kift, S., & Clarke, J. (2008).
Nelson, K., Kift, S., & Creagh, T. (2007).
Nelson, K., Kift, S., & Harper, W. (2005).
Nelson, K., Kift, S., Humphreys, J., & Harper, W. (2006).
New Zealand Ministry of Education. (2006).
Nulty, D. (2010).
Nulty, D., & Müller, M. (2009).
O'Byrne, J., & Thompson, R. (2005).
Oliver, R. (2006).
O'Shea, S., & Lysaght, P. (2010).
Papinczak, T., & Young, L. (2009).
Papinczak, T., Young, L., Groves, M., & Haynes, M. (2008).
Parappilly, M., Quinton, J., & Andersson, G. (2009).
Pargetter, R., McInnes, C., James, R., Evans, M., Peel, M., & Dobson, I. (1999).
Pascarella, E., & Terenzini, P. (2004).
Pascoe, V. (2008).
Paton, M. (2006).
Paulk, M., Weber, C., Curtis, B., & Chrissis, M. (1995).
Payne, T., Kirkpatrick, D., Goodacre, C., & McLean, P. (2006).
Pearce, A. (2009).
Pearson, M., Roberts, P., O'Shea, C., & Lupton, M. (2002).
Peat, M., Dalziel, J., & Grant, A. (2000).
Peat, M., Dalziel, J., & Grant, A. (2001).
Peat, M., & Franklin, S. (2002).
Peat, M., Franklin, S., Devlin, M., & Charles, M. (2005).
Pelliccione, L., & Albon, R. (2004).
Penman, J., & White, F. (2006).
Pepper, C. (2010).
Perry, C., & Allard, A. (2003).
Pillay, H., Clarke, J., & Taylor, P. (2006).
Pitkethly, A., & Prosser, M. (2001).
Potter, A., & Lynch, K. (2008).
Potter, A., & Parkinson, A. (2010).
Powell, S., & Peel, M. (2000).

- Prebble, T., Hargraves, H., Leach, L., Naidoo, K., Suddaby, G., & Zepke, N. (2004).
- Purnell, S. (2003).
- Purnell, S. (2004).
- Quinn, C., Smith, J., Duncan, M., Clarke, J., & Nelson, K. (2009).
- Rayner, G., & Cridland, C. (2009).
- Read, J., George, A., Masters, A., & King, M. (2005).
- Reid, E., & Solomonides, I. (2010).
- Rhoden, C., & Boin, K. (2004).
- Richardson, P., & Gough, J. (2001).
- Richardson, S., & Coates, H. (2010).
- Rienks, J., & Taylor, S. (2009).
- Rivers, J. (Ed.). (2005).
- Rochecouste, J., Oliver, R., Mulligan, D., & Davies, M. (2010).
- Ross, C. (c. 2008–2009).
- Ross, P., & Tronson, D. (2005).
- Salter, S., Douglas, T., Pittaway, J., Swabey, K., & Capstick, M. (2010).
- Sankey, M., & Lawrence, J. (2008).
- Sanson, M. (2009).
- Sawir, E., Marginson, S., Deumert, A., Nyland, C., & Ramia, G. (2008).
- Sawyer, T., & Scutter, S. (2009).
- Schier, M., Mulvany, J., & Shaw, J. (2010).
- Schulte, J. (2006).
- Scott, C., McKain, V., & Jarman, R. (2000).
- Scouller, K., Bonanno, H., Smith, L., & Krass, I. (2008).
- Scull, S., & Cuthill, M. (2010).
- Scutter, S., & King, S. (2010).
- Scutter, S., & Wood, D. (2009).
- Shackleford, N., & Blickem, C. (2007).
- Shannon, S. (2006).
- Sharma, M., Mendez, A., & O'Byrne, J. (2005).
- Shulman, L. (1998).
- Shulruf, B., Hattie, J., & Tumen, S. (2008).
- Simeoni, R. (2009).
- Skene, J. (2003).
- Skene, J., & Evamy, S. (2009).
- Skene, J., Hogan, J., & Brown, J. (2006).
- Skyrme, G. (2007).
- Smith, C., Isaacs, G., Holzi, A., Herbert, D., & Roulston, K. (2000).
- Smith, E. (2010).
- Snepvangers, K., & Yorke, A. (2002).
- Speilberger, C., Gorsuch, R., Lushene, P., Vagg, P., & Jacobs, A. (1983).
- Stanley, D., & Lapsley, J. (2008).
- Star, C., & McDonald, J. (2007).
- Stone, C. (2000).
- Stone, C. (2005).
- Strauss, P., & U, A. (2007).
- Stupans, I., Albrecht, T., Coffee, J., Elliot, E., Giles, E., King, S., Pearce, K., Sawyer, T., Scutter, S., & Ward, H. (2009).
- Sturgess, P., & Kennedy, M. (2004).
- Surjan, Y., Chiarelli, P., Dempsey, S., Lyall, D., O'Toole, G., Snodgrass, S., & Tessier, J. (2010).
- Swing, R. (2003).
- Syron, M., & McLaughlin, J. (2010).
- Taylor, J. (2008).
- Taylor, P., Millwater, J., & Nash, R. (2007).
- Taylor, P., Pillay, H., & Clarke, J. (2004).
- Tchen, G., Carter, A., Gibbons, P., & McLaughlin, P. (2001).
- Teakle, N. (2008).
- The Quality Assurance Agency for Higher Education Scotland. (2008).
- Thiele, M. (2008).
- Thompson, G., Pilgrim, A., & Oliver, K. (2005).
- Tinto, V. (2006–2007).
- Tinto, V. (2009).
- Todd, N., & Ballantyne, J. (2007).
- Truvert, T. (2010).
- van der Meer, J., Jansen, E., & Torenbeek, M. (2010).
- van der Meer, J., & Scott, C. (2008).
- van der Meer, J., & Scott, C. (2009).
- van der Meer, J., Scott, S., & Neha, T. (2010).
- van Rensburg, B., Danaher, P., & van Rensburg, H. (2010).
- Vardi, I. (2000).
- Wahr, F., Gray, K., & Radloff, A. (2009).
- Walck, D., & Hensby, S. (2003).
- Walker, K. (2001).
- Walker, L. (2010).
- Walker, R. [Ranginui]. (2005).
- Walker, R. [Rebecca], Spronken-Smith, R., Bond, C., McDonald, F., Reynolds, J., & McMartin, A. (2010).
- Waters, D. (2004).
- Waycott, J., & Kennedy, G. (2009).
- Wells, I., Kift, S., & Field, R. (2008).
- Werth, S., Southey, K., & Lynch, B. (2009).
- West, R. (1998).
- White, F. (2009).
- White, R. (2010).
- Whittington, V., & Thompson, C. (2010).
- Willcoxson, L. (2010).
- Williams, A., & Sher, W. (2007).
- Wilson, K. (2009).
- Wilson, K., & Lizzio, A. (2008).

- Wilson, S. (2007).
Winning, T., Lekkas, D., & Townsend, G. (2007).
Wood, D. (2009).
Wood, D. (2010).
Wood, G., & Petocz, P. (2008).
Woodbridge, S., & Osmond, J. (2009).
Wright, S. (2010).
Wylie, J. (2005).
Yeo, A., & Zadnik, M. (2004).
Yeo, S. (2006).
Yeo, S. (2007).
Yeung, A., Read, J., & Schmid, S. (2005).
Yorke, M. (2006).
Yorke, M., & Longden, B. (2004).
Yorke, M., & Longden, B. (2008).
Zeegers, P., & Martin, L. (2001).
Zeeng, L., Robbie, D., Markham-Adams, K., & Hutchison, C. (2009).
Zepke, N., & Leach, L. (2005).
Zepke, N., & Leach, L. (2007).
Zepke, N., & Leach, L. (2010a).
Zepke, N., & Leach, L. (2010b).
Zepke, N., Leach, L., & Butler, P. (2010).
Zepke, N., Leach, L., & Prebble, T. (2006).
Zepke, N., Leach, L., Prebble, T., Campbell, A., Coltman, D., Dewart, B., Gibson, M., Henderson, J., Leadbeater, J., Purnell, S., Rowan, L., Solomon, N., & Wilson, S. (2005).
Zhang, F., Lidbury, B., Schulte, J., Bridgeman, A., Yates, B., & Rodger, J. (2010).
Zimitat, C. (2003).
Zimitat, C. (2006).
Zimitat, C., & Sebastian, D. (2007).

Acronyms used in tables

Conferences

AAEE	Australasian Association for Engineering Education Conference
AARE	Australian Association for Research in Education Conference
ACEC	Australasian Computing Education Conference
AePS	Australian ePortfolio Symposium
ANZMA	Australia and New Zealand Marketing Academy Conference
APEI	Asia-Pacific Education Integrity Conference
ASCILITE	Australasian Society for Computers in Learning in Tertiary Education Conference
ATNA	Australian Technology Network Assessment Conference
AUQF	Australian Universities Quality Forum
CSULT	Charles Sturt University Learning and Teaching Conference
FYHECDS	First Year in Higher Education Curriculum Design Symposium
HERDSA	Higher Education Research and Development Society of Australasia Conference
IIEA	ISANA International Education Association Conference
LASHE	Language and Academic Skills in Higher Education Conference
LL	Lifelong Learning Conference
MSU	Motivating Science Undergraduates Conference
PRFYHE	Pacific Rim First Year in Higher Education Conference
SEDA	Staff and Educational Development Conference
STLS	Science Teaching and Learning Symposium
TLF	Teaching and Learning Forum

Journals

AEHE	Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education
AEP	Australian Economic Papers
AHHE	Arts and Humanities in Higher Education
AHSE	Advances in Health Science Education
AJCD	Australian Journal of Career Development
AJEE	Australasian Journal of English Education
AJET	Australasian Journal of Educational Technology
AJOE	Australian Journal of Outdoor Education
AJTE	Australian Journal of Teacher Education
ALHE	Active Learning in Higher Education
ALJ	Australian Library Journal
ASS	Asian Social Science
AUR	Australian Universities Review
CE	Computers and Education
COM	Communiqué
CR	Campus Review
EFH	Education for Health

ERA	Education in Rural Australia
ERGO	ergo
FOHPE	Focus on Health Professional Education
HE	Higher Education
HERD	Higher Education Research and Development
HN	HERDSA News
IER	Issues in Educational Research
IETI	Innovations in Education and Teaching International ²⁶
IJFYHE	International Journal of the First Year in Higher Education
IJLT	International Journal of Learning Technology
IJMEST	International Journal of Mathematical Education in Science and Technology
IJPL	International Journal of Pedagogics and Learning
IJSE	International Journal of Science Education
IS	Instructional Science
JALA	Journal of Adult Learning Aotearoa
JANZSSA	Journal of the Australian and New Zealand Student Services Association
JEE	Journal of Educational Enquiry
JGHE	Journal of Geography in Higher Education
JHEPM	Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management
JIR	Journal of Institutional Research
JSIE	Journal of Studies in International Education
JUTLP	Journal of University Teaching and Learning Practice
LER	Legal Education Review
MR	MAI Review
NHE	New Horizons in Education
NZJTW	New Zealand Journal of Teacher Work
PE	Professional Educator
PEC	Prehospital Emergency Care
PR	Prospect
RISE	Research in Science Education
RPCE	Research in Post-Compulsory Education
SHE	Studies in Higher Education
SLEID	Studies in Learning Evaluation, Innovation and Development
SY	Synergy
THE	Teaching in Higher Education
UB	ultiBASE
WPLL	Widening Participation and Lifelong Learning

²⁶ In 2000, the title was Innovations in Education and Training International.

Reports

AKOA	Ako Aotearoa, the National Centre for Tertiary Teaching Excellence (New Zealand)
ALTC	Australian Learning and Teaching Council ²⁷
AUS-O	Australian Reports—Other
CSHE	Centre for The Study of Higher Education
NZ-O	New Zealand Reports—Other
TLRI	The Teaching and Learning Research Initiative (New Zealand)

Downloaded Copy

²⁷ Formerly The Carrick Institute for Learning and Teaching in Higher Education.

Source and number of items by year

Table 6: Source and number of items by year

		Conference papers																				Total		
Year	FYHE		Teaching, learning and administration in higher education						Teaching, learning and administration in education (general)						Discipline/professional						N	%		
	ICFYE	PRFYHE	ASCILITE	AAPS	AUQF	CSULT	FYECDS	HERDSA	LASHE	AARE	ACEC	APEI	ATNA	LL	TLF	AEEF	ANZMA	IIEA	MSU	STLS			SEDA	
2000		9					1								1								11	5.3
2001							1	1	4						1								7	3.4
2002									2				1		1								17	8.2
2003								3	1														15	7.2
2004																	1						10	4.8
2005									1														12	5.8
2006																							17	8.2
2007															2								15	7.2
2008	1																						16	7.7
2009																					1		47	22.7
2010																							40	19.3
N	1	107	20	1	1	2	4	24	4	8	4	11.6	1.9	1.9	3.9	0.5	1.0	1.4	3	1	1	11	207	100.0
%	0.5	51.7	9.7	0.5	0.5	1.0	1.9	11.6	1.9	3.9	0.5	1.0	1.4	1.4	3.9	0.5	0.5	0.5	1.4	0.5	0.5	5.3		
N	108		56						25						18						207			
% No.1	52.2		27.1						12.1						8.7						100.0			
% No.2	27.2		14.0						6.3						4.5						51.90			

%No.1: % within the category. For example: 'Teaching, learning and administration in higher education' conference papers make up 27.1% (56/207) of all conference papers.
 %No.2: % of all items of literature. For example: 'Teaching, learning and administration in higher education' conference papers make up 14.0% (56/399) of all items; 'Conference papers' make up 51.9% (207/399) of items of literature.

Table 6: Source and number of items by year (cont.)

Journal articles																			
FYHE		Teaching, learning and administration in higher education																	
Year	IUFYHE	ALHE	AHHE	AEHE	AUR	CR	COM	ERGO	HERD	HN	HE	JANSSA	JUTLP	RPCE	SHE	SY	THE	UB	
2000												2							
2001								8				3							
2002			1	1								1				1			
2003																		1	
2004								1	1	1		1	1		1				
2005		1									2					1			
2006								1				1	1		1				
2007					1				3	1					1			1	
2008				1		1			3			1	1		2				
2009					1		2	1	2	1	2	1	3			1			
2010	6	1		1					4		1		3	1	2				
N	6	2	1	3	2	1	2	1	22	3	3	12	9	1	7	3	1	1	1
%	4.6	1.5	0.8	2.3	1.5	0.8	1.5	0.8	16.91	2.3	2.3	9.2	6.9	0.8	5.4	2.3	0.8	0.8	0.8
N	6	74																	
% No.1	4.6	56.9																	
% No.2	1.5	18.5																	

%No.1: % within the category. For example: 'Teaching, learning and administration in higher education' journal articles make up 56.9% (74/130) of all journal articles.

%No.2: % of all items of literature. For example: 'Teaching, learning and administration in higher education' journal articles make up 18.5% (74/399) of all items of literature.

Table 6: Source and number of items by year (cont.)

Journal articles (cont.)																	
Teaching, learning and administration in education (general)																	
Year	ASS	AJET	AJPL	JETI	IS	IULT	IJPL	IER	JALA	JEE	JIR	JSIE	MR	NHE	NJTW	SLEID	WPLL
2000				1							2			1			
2001											1						1
2002											1						
2003								1		1							1
2004				1		1										1	
2005		1														1	
2006																	
2007							1										
2008	1		1									1					
2009															1	5	
2010					1				1				1				
N	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	4	1	1	1	1	7	2
%	0.8	0.8	0.8	1.5	0.8	0.8	0.8	0.8	0.8	0.8	3.1	0.8	0.8	0.8	0.8	5.4	1.5
N	28																
% No.1	21.5																
% No.2	7.0																

%No.1: % within the category. For example: 'Teaching, learning and administration in education (general)' journal articles make up 21.5% (28/130) of all journal articles.
 %No.2: % of all items of literature. For example: 'Teaching, learning and administration in education (general)' journal articles make up 7.0% (28/399) of all items of literature.

Table 6: Source and number of items by year (cont.)

Journal articles (cont.)																				
Year	Discipline/professional															Total				
	AHSE	AEP	AJCD	AJOE	AJTE	ALJ	AJEE	ERA	EFH	FOHPE	IUMEST	IUSE	JGHE	LER	PEC	PE	PR	RISE	N	%
2000							3							1					10	7.7
2001								1											14	10.8
2002																			5	3.8
2003			1																5	3.8
2004						1													9	6.9
2005				1				1			1	1	1	1		1			13	10.0
2006		1													1				6	4.6
2007										1							1		10	7.7
2008	1																	1	14	10.8
2009					1					1									22	16.9
2010																			22	16.9
N	1	1	1	1	1	1	3	1	1	2	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	1	130	100.0
%	0.8	0.8	0.8	0.8	0.8	0.8	2.3	0.8	0.8	1.5	0.8	0.8	0.8	1.5	0.8	0.8	0.8	0.8		
N	22															130				
% No.1	16.9															100.0				
% No.2	5.5															32.6				

%No.1: % within the category. For example: 'Discipline/professional' journal articles make up 16.9% (22/130) of all journal articles.
 %No.2: % of all items of literature. For example: 'Discipline/professional' journal articles make up 5.5% (22/399) of all items of literature.

Table 6: Source and number of items by year (cont.)

Year	Other											ALL ITEMS		
	Book chapters	Reports							Thesis	N	%	N	%	
		AKOA	TLRI	ALTC	CSHE	AU-O	NZ-O							
2000				1	1						2	3.2	23	5.8
2001											0	0.0	21	5.3
2002	1				3			1			5	8.1	27	6.8
2003					1				1		2	3.2	22	5.5
2004				1	1				1		3	4.8	22	5.5
2005			1	1					3		7	11.3	32	8.0
2006	1		1		2				3		7	11.3	30	7.5
2007			1	2				1			6	9.7	31	7.8
2008		1	1	4	3						9	14.5	39	9.8
2009	1	1		3	4						9	14.5	78	19.5
2010			2	5	4			1			12	19.4	74	18.5
N	3	2	6	14	23	9	9	1	9	62	100.0	399	100.0	
%	4.8	3.2	9.7	22.6	37.1	14.5	1.6							
N	61													
% No.2	15.5													

%No.2: % of all items of literature.



Appendix 2: Equity groups

Table 7: Non-traditional and equity group focus by year

Year	Non-traditional			Equity groups						TOTAL
	Australian Indigenous	Māori	Pasifika	People with a disability	Low SES	Mature age	EAL/NESB/International	Rural and isolated	Equity groups in general	
2000		1				1				2
2001	1								1	2
2002						1	1	1	1	4
2003					1					1
Total	1	1	0	0	1	2	1	1	2	9
%	11.1	11.1	0.0	0.0	11.1	22.2	1.1	11.1	22.2	100.0
2004							1	1		2
2005		1						1		2
2006		1	2	1				2		6
2007				1			3	2	2	8
Total	0	2	2	2	0	0	4	6	2	18
%	0.0	11.1	11.1	11.1	0.0	0.0	22.2	33.3	11.1	100.0
2008		3	2				1		2	8
2009	1	1				1	1	3	6	13
2010	1	3	3	1	1	1	4	1	3	18
Total	2	7	5	1	1	2	6	4	11	39
%	5.1	17.9	12.8	2.6	2.6	5.1	15.4	10.3	28.2	100.0
TOTAL	3	10	7	3	2	4	11	11	15	66
%	4.5	15.2	10.6	4.5	3.0	6.1	16.7	16.7	22.7	100.0

Downloaded Copy

Karen Nelson is a Professor and the Director of Student Success and Retention at Queensland University of Technology (QUT). Organisationally, she is located in the Learning and Teaching Unit in the Chancellery and responsibility for the first year experience falls within her portfolio. Before joining QUT, Karen held senior positions as a project manager and information management consultant in the health and finance sectors and she now uses these skills to manage large scale teaching and learning projects in the higher education sector. As Director, Karen's work focuses on four areas of institutional policy, strategy and practice: curriculum design and enactment, proactive student support, a sense of belonging, and staff development. Her higher education research and publications focus on student engagement, the first year experience and institutional responses to these, in particular institutional strategies for enhancing students' engagement and learning experiences.

Karen is also the Chair of the International First Year in Higher Education Conference and the Editor-in-chief of the *International Journal of the First Year in Higher Education*.

John Clarke is an Adjunct Professor associated with Student Success and Retention in the Learning and Teaching Unit at Queensland University of Technology (QUT). From 2007–2009, John was the Project Manager of the Transitions-In Project at QUT, which focused on facilitating the transition into QUT of commencing students and that interest has continued as a Co-Editor of the *International Journal of the First Year in Higher Education*. Prior to the Project Manager role, he was an Associate Professor in the Faculty of Education at QUT where he coordinated the Doctor of Education program. John has a history of working and researching in the fields of classroom learning and interaction and learning environments, particularly at the tertiary level, and also has an interest in social science research methodology and its application to learning environment research.

Sally Kift is a Professor of Law at Queensland University of Technology (QUT), where she has served as Law Faculty Assistant Dean, Teaching and Learning (2001–2006) and QUT's foundational Director, First Year Experience (2006–2007). Sally is a national teaching award winner (2003) and national program award winner (2007). She was awarded a Senior Fellowship by the Australian Learning and Teaching Council (ALTC) in 2006 to investigate the first year experience (FYE) and is an ALTC Discipline Scholar in Law. Most recently, she has been appointed to the inaugural Australian Law School Standards Committee. Sally has published widely on teaching quality and improvement, legal education, student engagement, transitions, capstone and the FYE and has received numerous national and international invitations to deliver keynote addresses, workshops and seminars on these and related issues. She has a substantial record of attracting grant and consultancy income and is frequently asked to sit on higher education review and appointment panels, to evaluate teaching excellence, grant outcomes and curriculum renewal across the disciplines, and to advise on whole-of-institution approaches to the FYE.

Sally is a Co-Editor of the *International Journal of the First Year in Higher Education* and is a previous Chair of the International First Year in Higher Education Conference.

Tracy Creagh is a Project Manager at Queensland University of Technology managing a project funded by an Australian Learning and Teaching Council (ALTC) Competitive Grant—*Good practice for safeguarding student learning engagement in higher education institutions* (2010–2012). The aim of the project is to develop a set of principles, guidelines and resources, based on the principles of social justice, to safeguard activities designed to monitor student learning engagement. Tracy is also Journal Manager for the *International Journal of the First Year in Higher Education*. Since 2005 Tracy has worked in a research capacity on numerous teaching and learning projects, both within the university and commissioned by the ALTC. The specific focus of her research activities has been the first year experience of students and ePortfolios and learning (Australian ePortfolio Project Stage 1 & 2). She gained her Masters of Information Management in 2011.

I found this book a treasure chest of research-informed ideas. It is a must for teachers of first year students at university.

Nick Zepke

Associate Professor, School of Educational Studies, College of Education
Massey University
Te Kunenga Ki Pūrehuroa

A valuable resource for anyone seeking information on how to improve the First Year Experience for students.

Judy Skene

Associate Director, Student Services (Student Support Services) and
Equity and Diversity Adviser
University of Western Australia

We couldn't have wished for a more succinct synthesis of the FYHE research of the past decade. It also clearly points to research tracks to explore for the second decade of this century. This publication will greatly benefit the Australasian FYHE community. Ka pai.

Jacques van der Meer

Associate Dean (Academic), College of Education
University of Otago
Te Whare Wānanga o Ōtāgo

An impressive up-to-date and comprehensive reference for all researchers in First Year in Higher Education. ... A complete overview of the issues in FYE. Fascinating!

Claire Macken

Associate Professor and Director, Flexible and Online Learning Development Projects
Curriculum, Teaching and Learning Centre
Office of the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Education)

If you are going into battle to broker changes of attitude in your institution towards the first year of students' tertiary experience, tuck this publication into your kitbag!

Margaret Henley

Associate Dean (Equity), Faculty of Arts
Department of Film, TV & Media Studies
University of Auckland
Te Whare Wānanga o Tāmaki Makaurau